

THE BIAS OF GREAT WEALTH

AN EXAMINATION OF
THE ACTIVITIES OF LEADING
AMERICAN FOUNDATIONS
AND THOSE WHO
DIRECT THEIR AFFAIRS

BY
FRANK HUGHES

Reprinted from PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS
THE DEVIN-ADAIR COMPANY, *Publishers, New York*
1951

COPYRIGHT 1950 by *Frank Hughes*. All rights reserved.
Manufactured in the United States.

Chapter Ten

THE BIAS OF GREAT WEALTH

(1)

THE "COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS" has brought a number of undocumented charges against the American newspaper press, one of which is that all newspapers are biased in behalf of wealth, "big business," and the large owners of property. The reader will recall an echo of this in the "golden age" argument in the preceding chapters—"Through concentration of ownership the variety of sources of news and opinion is limited."¹ And, in the same argument, "the press must, if it is to be wholly free, know and overcome any biases incident to its own economic position, its concentration, and its pyramidal organization."²

The "commission" belabors this allegation so heavily that it becomes necessary to submit it to a detailed and factual examination. It has, for instance, a three-page section in its general report entitled "The Bias of Owners," containing statements such as this:

"The agencies of mass communication are big business, and their owners are big businessmen. . . . The press is connected with other big businesses through the advertising of these businesses, upon which it depends for the major part of its revenue. The owners of the press, like the owners of other big businesses, are bank directors, bank borrowers, and heavy taxpayers in the upper brackets.

"As William Allen White put it: 'Too often the publisher of an American newspaper has made his money in some other calling than journalism. He is a rich man seeking power and pres-

tige. He has the country club complex. The business manager of this absentee owner quickly is afflicted with the country club point of view. Soon the managing editor's wife nags him into it. And they all get the unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth. . . ."³

Basically this is no different from the 100-per-cent Communist doctrine as presented by Hewlett Johnson, the "Red" Dean of Canterbury, in his book, *Soviet Power*, of which the Communist party distributed one million copies in the United States:⁴ "Our democracy . . . will never reach its fruition till we follow the Soviet lead and secure for all economic liberty and equality. It will shrink rather than grow as economic inequality increases. The vast fortunes, which enable wealthy individuals to gain so large a measure of control of the Press, already and subtly undermined much of our imagined and vaunted democratic liberty."⁵

This is not to say, of course, that William Allen White was a Communist; only that the charge originally came from the Communists, and the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" had to reach exceedingly far to get any "dignification" for it. What was quoted may even have been a misquotation of the late Emporia, Kansas, editor, and presented no facts. Mr. White didn't name any newspaper publishers, business managers, or managing editors he knew for a fact to have the "unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth," and he was acquainted with a great many editors and publishers. If Mr. White really made such a statement he certainly presented no substantiation of it. Newspaper editors are not the only ones who like the sound of their own rhetoric. Scholars, however, are supposed to know how to distinguish between rhetoric and fact.

This is another instance where the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," searching around for an opinion which coincided with its own particular prejudice, used it as a ground for generalization, and presented that generalization to the public as scholarly "confirmation" and truth. William Allen White also said that the "conduct and morals" of the American newspaper press is much higher than that of the "preachers who guide our spiritual life" and the "teachers who channel our youth."⁶ From

this opinion the generalization could be made that the morals and behavior of university professors is much worse than that of newspapers and their editors. The "Commission on Freedom of the Press" did not choose this opinion from William Allen White nor make any such generalization as that, although, on the evidence presented, it might be made with equal justice.

"Few editors are in jail or are on their way there," Mr. White added. "Few editors obviously and shamelessly defend malefactors of great wealth. The class consciousness of our profession does not seal our lips when one of our own calling makes a mistake. Our code does not require us to put the double hush on charges made against us either as individuals or against our calling. . . ."

Here is still another of Mr. White's opinions, which the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" did not choose to present to the public:

"If any group of bigots should attempt to undermine the liberties of the American people in the blind zeal of noble fanaticism, what institution would they seek to throttle and discredit? It would be the American press."⁸

Any allegation that the American press is "big business" or that its owners and managers are characterized by the "unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth" ought to be examined against the facts. A complete listing of the net worth and property of American newspapers cannot be made, because most of them offer no securities on the public market. Therefore, like other similar businesses, they do not make public financial reports. There is sufficient public information, however, to make an adequate sampling of the "bigness" of newspapers in the business world.

William Randolph Hearst's properties have always been represented, particularly by the Socialists and Communists, as the leading example of "bigness" in American newspaper publishing. In its discussion of "chains," the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" leads off with Mr. Hearst's newspapers, although it is constrained to admit that his properties have dropped from twenty-six to seventeen in number.⁹ Hearst Consolidated Publications, Inc., owns twelve of these newspapers—the largest

ones—a radio station, and three newsprint companies. These are the *New York Journal-American*, the *Chicago Herald-American*, the *Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American*, the *Detroit Times*, the *Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph*, the *San Antonio Light*, the *Los Angeles Examiner*, the *Los Angeles Evening Herald and Express*, the *Oakland Post-Enquirer*, the *San Francisco Call-Bulletin*, the *San Francisco Examiner*, the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, radio station WCAE, the Pejepscot Paper Company, the Quebec Newsprint Company, Ltd., and the Halifax Power & Pulp Company, Ltd. The 1947 consolidated balance sheet of Hearst Consolidated Publications, Inc., showed that it had property (net fixed assets) of \$37,485,979. The net worth of the company (capital and surplus) was \$115,365,820.¹⁰

Gannett Company, Inc., owns twenty-one newspapers in sixteen cities, fifteen of them dailies, together with six radio stations. Its balance sheet showed property amounting to \$2,561,432, and a net worth of \$13,593,302.¹¹ The *Chicago Daily News* reported a net worth of \$15,114,341.¹² The *New York Times* does not publish a balance sheet, none being required, but does list \$13,118,700 in outstanding preferred and common stock.¹³ The *Washington Times-Herald*, largest daily newspaper in the nation's capital, was estimated at the death of its publisher, Mrs. Eleanor Patterson, to be worth \$3,000,000 to \$7,000,000.¹⁴ Marshall Field's newspaper, *PM*, as has been previously noted, had a book value of \$800,000, including presses, equipment, and a 12-story building, at the time he transferred it to new owners in 1947. Book value, as also was noted, means little since Mr. Field paid \$375,000 additional to have the property taken away.

Against these figures, leading off with the \$115,365,820 reported net worth of Hearst Consolidated Publications, Inc., the reader is invited to compare what is ordinarily known as "big business" in America—American Telephone and Telegraph Co., Inc., with a 1948 reported net worth of \$9,310,257,409, and United States Steel, with a reported 1947 net worth of \$1,510,760,179;¹⁵ General Motors, with a net worth of \$1,570,575,801;¹⁶ Standard Oil of Indiana, with a net worth of \$924,870,060;¹⁷ General Electric, with a net worth of \$412,926,364,¹⁸ and

General Foods, with a net worth of \$132,313,984.¹⁹ The property ownership of these corporations compares in about the same ratio, American Telephone and Telegraph, for instance, reporting property of \$8,668,842,204, against the Hearst Corporation's \$37,485,979.²⁰ The comparison could be carried on down through banks, insurance companies, department stores, lumber companies, and almost any line of heavy-goods manufacturing, without showing anything except the relatively small size of daily newspapers in the industrial economy of "big business." Two out of 43 national banks in Chicago, for instance, the First National and the Continental National, have nearly four-fifths of the city's bank deposits.

This is the type of study that a body of university professors such as the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," having a large staff of assistants and a \$215,000 grant, was admirably equipped to do. It made no such study. The "commission" seems to have begun with the idea that newspapers possess property and material wealth, therefore they must be "biased" in favor of wealth. Whether consciously or not, this idea follows the doctrine of economic determinism, or the materialistic conception of history, first introduced into politics by Karl Marx, who said: "The method of production in material existence determines social, political, and spiritual evolution in general. It is not consciousness of mankind that determines its existence, but, on the contrary, its social existence that determines its consciousness."²¹

If the possession, management, or direction of large properties and large sums of money carries an innate poison which "biases" the individual in favor of "wealth," and if even salaried employes such as business managers and managing editors get this virus through association, as the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" has claimed, it is exceedingly strange that Chancellor Hutchins and his twelve fellow "commissioners" have not fallen victim to the plague. They are the managers of, stewards of, or employes of one of the greatest aggregations of private and untaxed wealth in the history of mankind. Again, the reader is invited to compare the net worth of newspaper properties with that of really "big business":

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

	Net Worth	Property
Harvard University	\$320,111,832.	\$100,000,000.*
Yale University	189,500,544.	50,000,000.*
Columbia University	157,365,581.	62,399,445.
University of Chicago	142,421,646.	43,889,281.
University of Michigan	133,144,677.	84,717,725.
University of California	124,970,826.	63,959,861.
University of Texas	119,958,622.	25,958,622.
Northwestern University	105,496,132.	30,338,000.
University of Rochester	102,095,259.	34,208,107.
University of Minnesota	97,297,914.	44,587,914.
University of Illinois	89,867,875.	50,626,573.
Cornell University	89,518,909.	30,335,010.
Princeton University	84,137,923.	30,000,000.*
Massachusetts Institute of Technology ...	84,083,000.	18,346,000.
Duke University	83,363,605.	31,646,832.
University of Pennsylvania	80,563,922.	36,093,922.
Stanford University	63,896,573.	19,905,145.
University of Wisconsin	57,112,948.	31,854,922.†
Ohio State University	56,523,447.	30,080,941.
Johns Hopkins University	52,702,861.	14,563,423.
New York University	58,089,017.	16,474,581.
Washington U. (St. Louis).....	46,378,551.	16,158,258.
Vanderbilt University	43,272,456.	8,536,480.
Rice Institute	39,484,096.	5,641,546.
Dartmouth College	38,750,000.	11,000,000.

(* Estimate—no formal valuation made.)

(† Value of buildings only, land is not included.)²²

These are only the twenty-five wealthiest universities and colleges of the 1,742 institutions of the higher learning reporting to the United States Office of Education, which stated that 1,440 of them, at the last accounting, held approximately \$4,-518,000,000 invested in permanent or quasi-permanent funds or in physical property.²⁸

It is worth noting that ten of the thirteen members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," who profess to find the "unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth" in newspaper people, are or have been connected with the four richest of these institutions, and Chancellor Hutchins, the chairman of the "commission," is the undisputed director of the \$142,421,646 fortune belonging to the University of Chicago, fourth-ranking institution in amount of wealth.²⁴

Another "commissioner," George N. Shuster, is in charge of an institution which has a more modest fortune, being president of Hunter College, New York City, which reported a net worth of \$21,912,604, with property valued at \$16,608,971,

current income of \$5,055,393, and a 1947-48 budget of \$4,943,674.²⁵ This, as a "big business," is considerably larger than the entire operation of Gannett Company, Inc., with its twenty-one newspapers and six radio stations. The twelfth "commissioner," Professor Niebuhr, is an employe of Union Theological Seminary, which has close relations with Columbia University, third richest of the institutions of higher learning.²⁶ The thirteenth "commissioner," Professor John Dickinson, teaches at the University of Pennsylvania, which has a net worth of \$80,563,922.

More than four and a half billion dollars of property tell only a part of the story of the "big business" nature of the higher learning from which come the members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." During 1943-44, for instance, 1,563 institutions spent a total of \$1,001,545,068, according to the United States Office of Education.²⁷ During the same year, 1,650 such institutions employed a teaching staff of 150,980 persons.²⁸ Said the "Commission on Freedom of the Press":

"The agencies of mass communication are big business. . . . The press is a large employer of labor. With its total wage and salary bill in the same [pre-war] year nearly a billion dollars, it provided about 4 per cent of the country's total salary and wage expenditures. The newspapers alone have more than 150,000 employees. . . ."²⁹

The reader may contrast this picture of the alleged "big business" character of the American newspaper press with the following statement by John Dale Russell, writing in *American Universities and Colleges, 1948*, the publication of the American Council on Education:

"Another striking tendency in the financing of higher education is the increased dependence on government funds and the increased willingness of government to provide funds for higher education. A hasty calculation indicates that in the budget year 1947-48 the federal government alone is paying in the neighborhood of \$1,500,000,000 for services in higher education, exclusive of grants for research, but including maintenance grants to students as well as payments for their instruction. Most of the state legislatures have been relatively generous in the post-war years in providing appropriations for higher education."³⁰

It is little wonder, with this degree of largess, institutions of the higher learning exhibit pro-government bias in their curriculum and teaching. Billions seem to be piling in upon billions in the industry with which all the members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" are affiliated, either as directors and managers or as employes or former employes. To all this wealth, of course, must be added the estimated \$2,000,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 in capital assets of the 700 philanthropic foundations in the United States,³¹ which are disbursing in the neighborhood of \$100,000,000 a year,³² virtually every cent of it through educators or former educators allied with the higher learning. The spending of these foundation millions is done by university professors and former professors who are executive officers or members of the professional staff of the organizations, and it is idle to claim that the business men who are on the foundation boards of trustees have much to do with it. Even such sympathetic commentators as Shelby M. Harrison and F. Emerson Andrews of the Russell Sage Foundation admit that:

"The primary function of a board of trustees is the broad determination of policies in harmony with the foundation's charter. However completely authority has been vested in the board, it has neither the time nor usually the special knowledge required for detailed administration of the work of the larger foundations. . . ." ³³

Still another proof of the "big business" nature of the higher learning, which is the business of the members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," is the extent to which colleges and universities actually have gone into competitive business enterprises in the last few years. A recent *New York Times* survey showed that 455 such institutions earned \$150,492,583 from operating commercial ventures in 1947, including large scale real estate and big factories. Chancellor Hutchins' University of Chicago, for instance, is one of the richest single landlords in Chicago, collecting rents from many commercial properties, and it also owns the preferred stock in Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., a commercial publishing venture. New York University owns a spaghetti factory which earns \$600,000 to \$800,-

000 a year, on which the firm, in private hands, used to pay \$240,000 to \$300,000 taxes.³⁴ "Educational funds," of course, are tax-exempt. It would be difficult to find an American newspaper owner so greedy for profit he added spaghetti presses to printing presses to compound a fortune.

From these facts the following points would appear to be obvious: 1) If control of, the spending of, and association with great sums of wealth produce a "bias" in favor of wealth, as the Marxians insist, then Chancellor Hutchins and the other members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," on a quantitative basis, should be much more prejudiced by the "unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth" than any American newspaper; 2) Newspapers are producers, and what wealth they have, they, themselves, have created; educators are the spenders and produce very little material wealth; granting full credit to their invaluable contribution to the society and to every citizen, educators still depend on others to produce the wealth which they spend; 3) the funds which Chancellor Hutchins and his fellow "commissioners" spend are tax-exempt; in addition, they take other funds directly from the pockets of the taxpayer; newspapers not only create new wealth for the whole of society, they pay taxes upon it.

The "Commission on Freedom of the Press," without presenting facts, denounced the American newspaper press for "bias" concerning its alleged "concentration and its pyramidal organization."³⁵ From this, one would expect the facts to show that great groups of newspapers are owned by large corporations, which in turn are owned by each other, with interlocking directorates and common direction from the top. Actually nothing is further from the truth. The "commission," as has been previously noted, was forced to admit that "the number of papers controlled by national chains has actually declined in recent years."³⁶ The seventeen Hearst newspapers, the eighteen Scripps-Howard newspapers, the fifteen Gannett dailies, and the three McCormick-Patterson dailies out of a total of 1,873 daily newspapers in the nation were the only "chains" the "commission" could find to single out by name.

To bolster its argument, the "commission" invented a term—

"regional chain"—which consists of any publishing company owning newspapers in different localities. This is something like calling the University of Chicago a "chain university" because it has a campus on the Midway and a college in Chicago's Loop. Even so, the "commission" could find only seventy-six "chains—national, regional, and local,"³⁷ in the nation. The term "pyramidal organization" would imply an interlocking between these ownership groups. Actually, the newspaper business, because of its highly competitive nature, is one of the few industries in America where there has never been so much as a hint of such interrelationship. No man ever served as a director of the Hearst companies and of the Scripps-Howard Company, for instance, at the same time. Such an alliance would be intolerable to any publishing company, although it is common practice in some other fields, particularly among the trustees, directors, and regents of universities and the great foundations. It is in the field of the higher learning that "pyramidal organization" today reaches its zenith.

In fact, the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" seems to have blamed the American newspaper press for virtually every sin of which the members of its own profession appear to be guilty. Newspapers, for instance, never have handed back and forth large sums of money between each other, or given financial assistance to each other. Such a practice would be considered a public scandal, although it is indulged in as a matter of course by the large so-called philanthropic foundations, even though some of them have charters forbidding it.

The \$189,000,000 Rockefeller Foundation, in 1946, gave \$21,000 to the \$810,000 Woodrow Wilson Foundation;³⁸ the \$166,000,000 Carnegie Corporation, in 1947, gave \$4,000 to the \$1,068,000 World Peace Foundation;³⁹ over a period of years it gave \$200,000 to the \$20,000,000 Julius Rosenwald Fund;⁴⁰ in 1942, it gave \$86,000 to the \$17,000,000 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching;⁴¹ in 1942, it appropriated \$450,000 for the \$44,000,000 Carnegie Institution; between 1941 and 1947 it gave \$505,000 to the \$11,000,000 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, directed from 1945 to 1949 by Alger Hiss.⁴² In the former year the Carnegie Corporation in-

creased its usual gift of \$75,000 to \$100,000.⁴³ The corporation frankly admitted the restrictions in its charter:

"The charter of the Corporation does not permit it to share in the international program of the Endowment, but the sum of \$75,000 was granted toward support of the educational program of the Endowment for the promotion of the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States."⁴⁴

In spite of this pious declaration, the Carnegie Corporation did "share in the international program of the Endowment." The gift of \$75,000 to the Endowment released that much of the Endowment's own funds for the "international program," and any statement to the contrary is pure fiction.

As to "concentration," every major foundation in America, with only two exceptions—the American Council of Learned Societies and the Guggenheim Foundation—gives money only to projects which are under "supervision."⁴⁵ This means that the projects are under control of the great universities or of outright propaganda agencies, such as the Foreign Policy Association, the Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Council on Foreign Affairs, which have university professors on their boards. It also means that very little money is available for fostering individual and independent thought and research unless the top authorities in the higher learning approve. A more tight and monopolistic control of great wealth would be hard to find in any other segment of the American economy.

Adding to this concentration of power in the higher learning and foundation realm is an interlocking of directorates which is never found among American newspapers. Henry Allen Moe, for instance, was a member of the selection committee of the Rosenwald Fund; a trustee of the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation; a member of the Social Science Research Council, which spends both Carnegie and Rockefeller money; and a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation.⁴⁶ John Foster Dulles is a trustee of both the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation.⁴⁷ Alger Hiss was president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and at the same time trustee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.⁴⁸

There is an enormous concentration and interlocking among the multi-million-dollar foundations and the large universities which have the most wealth. John Sloan Dickey, for instance, is a former State Department publicity man who is now a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, the Brookings Institution, and Dartmouth College, of which he is also president.⁴⁹ General Dwight D. Eisenhower is a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and president of Columbia University, around which a great amount of the spending of Carnegie public money revolves.⁵⁰ Harold L. Swift, trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation was, for twenty-six years, chairman of the board of the University of Chicago.⁵¹ David Rockefeller, whose brother and father are on the Rockefeller Foundation board, is a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment and of the University of Chicago.⁵² Marshall Field, donor of the Field Foundation, is a trustee of the University of Chicago and of the Julius Rosenwald Fund.⁵³ Laird Bell, the new chairman of the board of the University of Chicago, is also chairman of Carleton College and a member of the Harvard University board of overseers.

The list is almost limitless. One recent study found that fifty-four trusteeships in twenty-nine foundations were held by men who were also trustees of universities, including three university board members who were trustees of the General (Rockefeller) Education Board, three in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and five in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.⁵⁴ If the American newspaper press ever presented any such interlocked control or directorate the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" and other pedantic critics might be somewhat warranted in talking about "pyramidal organization," "monopoly," and "concentration." On the contrary, the press is free from it, a fact that careful scholars would have noted.

There are other ways besides the financial and organizational ones in which the universities and institutions of the higher learning exhibit a monopolistic and unassailably tight concentration of power in the society. They "accredit" each other. They vouch for each other's scholastic standing and merit.

For the most part, organizations which have been set up for accreditation of schools, colleges, and universities are composed of educators drawn from these institutions and having direct and binding ties to them, so that few outsiders have a chance. The universities grant honorary degrees and honors to members of each other's administrative staff, faculty, and boards extending the practice, of course, to the directors of the money-giving foundations.⁵⁵

The possibilities which this tightly organized group of institutions, combined with enormous untaxed wealth, offer for dictatorial thought control and rule by cliques of oligarchs will be discussed as the facts develop. Because of its monopolistic, plutocratic nature it offers an ideal opportunity for dedication to fixed political and economic ideologies and the stifling of minority disagreement. What Harvard has ever criticized what University of Chicago, for instance, for loading its social science faculty with a group of socialists and turning its course syllabi into a collection of propaganda leaflets resembling nothing so much as a bound volume of Karl Marx' *New Rhenish Gazette*?⁵⁶ And when, some fourteen years ago, Chancellor Hutchins' institution faced public charges of "teaching communism," who came through with \$3,000,000 to help him defeat "Hearst and the rest of the nightshirts"?—why, of course, the Rockefellers.⁵⁷ Was there then any denial of or outcry against Communism from Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Dartmouth, or any of the other institutions of the higher learning, or from the manifold foundations or other public trusts?

Such unanimity of opinion, of course, is impossible in the American newspaper press, where totalitarian "liberals" and real liberals take sides on every public question, and where individual ownership and freedom from financial concentration and interlocking directorships permit free discussion. As William Allen White said, the unwritten code of the press does not require newspapers "to put the double hush on charges made against us either as individuals or against our calling."

These remarks would have little point, however, if it were not for the fact that the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" and every member of it, ranging from the original sponsors

down through the salaried members of its staff, are so closely identified with the big-university, big-foundation oligarchy which seems to suffer from so many of the social deficiencies and irresponsibilities the "commission" has attributed to newspapers. It can be argued that university professors, as a rule, do not have much to say about the management or disposal of the multi-million-dollar funds their institutions possess or about the spending of the great foundation fortunes.

But the professors and former professors selected by Chancellor Hutchins to form the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" are of a special kind. They number some of the most important directors and spenders of this entrenched wealth, held in "public trust," and others in the same company are among the most skillful and persuasive in obtaining thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars from this huge tax-free satrapy to finance their personal academic projects and endeavors. If there is a common denominator among them, aside from predilection for left-wing social philosophy and a distaste for facts, it is their identification with the management or the spending of huge sums of public money. The story of their associations is intricate and detailed, but it is interesting enough to lay, in at least outline form, before the readers.

In the first place, four members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" come directly or originally from the University of Chicago (net worth \$142,421,646), four from Harvard (\$320,111,832), and one each from Yale (\$189,500,544), Columbia (\$157,365,581), and the University of Pennsylvania (\$80,563,922). Of the remaining two, President Shuster's identification with Hunter College (\$21,912,604) already is in the record, while Professor Niebuhr's connection with Columbia's \$157,365,581 through Union Theological Seminary, which has affiliations with Columbia, also is in the record. If there was any truth in the doctrine that possession of wealth creates a bias in favor of the wealthy class, then there ought to be a great deal of such bias in this aggregation of educators, spending or directing all these millions. This, truly, is the well-fed aristocracy of the higher learning, the academically wealthy, with millions at their command. We will find, as the investigation

progresses, that they have a great deal of bias. But it is not the bias of "economic determinism" that Karl Marx talked about. Instead of bias in favor of the wealthy class, their bias is against wealth and toward the direction of socialism, a fact that merely adds more evidence that Marx was wrong.

Beginning with the financing of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," only two sources gave it money. One was Time, Inc., which is owned by Henry Luce, and the other was Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. This is a publishing house, dealing in encyclopedias, text books, films, and other ventures, which was rescued from financial straits by Sears, Roebuck & Co., and "given" to the University of Chicago. Chancellor Hutchins, as head of the university, has assumed editorial control over it and a place on the board.

William Benton, former head of the advertising firm, Benton and Bowles, and former Assistant Secretary of State, took part in the deal which transferred the encyclopedia to the university. He was a vice-president of the University of Chicago at the time.⁵⁸ Not all of the stock of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., was given to the university, and part of that which was not was purchased by Benton. He thereby became a part owner of the encyclopedia, and is chairman of its board of directors, on which both Henry Luce and Mr. Hutchins serve. The Britannica is "big business," having an annual budget of about \$28,000,000.

Luce, Hutchins, and Benton are old friends. Luce is said to have been instrumental in getting Benton appointed as Assistant Secretary of State in 1945. The story told by State Department insiders is that James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State, sought Luce's advice on the appointment of an assistant secretary for "information" and public affairs, and sent him a list of names. The list came back with a check-mark before the name of William Benton, so it is said, and Benton got the job.

Alger Hiss,⁵⁹ formerly head of the State Department's office of special political affairs, president of the \$125,000,000 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and convicted for perjury on two counts, one for denying he passed State Department documents to a Communist spy, said in an interview⁶⁰ that Ben-

ton was responsible for the appointment of Professor Zechariah Chafee Jr. as the American delegate to the United Nations sub-commission on freedom of information and of the press. According to Hiss, Benton was the first to suggest Professor Chafee's name. Professor Chafee was vice-chairman of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."

John Sloan Dickey, now president of Dartmouth College, was an assistant in the State Department office of public information which was under the direction of Assistant Secretary Archibald MacLeish and was taken over from him by Benton. Dickey never held a teaching job before becoming president of the college in 1946. He is now a member of the board of the Rockefeller Foundation. In his first year at Dartmouth, Dickey established a course, required of all seniors, called "Great Issues of the Modern World." He financed this by obtaining a \$75,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation, a "public trust." The course used cuttings from current metropolitan newspapers, and taught students to judge the truth of these newspapers by the manner in which they followed, both in news columns and editorials, the foreign policy line of the Roosevelt-Truman administration, in which Dickey formerly had worked. Newspapers which deviated from this political doctrine were exhibited to the students on a bulletin board in ridicule.⁶¹ This was supposed to be "education" and direction as to how the student should conduct himself in a "democracy."

The man who helped Dickey establish this course at Dartmouth, and who was one of the most frequent lecturers on its curriculum was Archibald MacLeish, a member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."⁶² MacLeish, who preceded Benton as Assistant Secretary of State, was also head of the Library of Congress. The Rockefeller Foundation has given the Library of Congress more than \$300,000 in cash grants⁶³ and in 1942 alone, when MacLeish was at the helm, gave the library approximately \$90,000.⁶⁴

In the same year, the Rockefeller Foundation completed a three-year grant of \$81,800 to the Library of Congress "toward a study of communication trends in war time, under the direction of Dr. Harold D. Lasswell."⁶⁵ Lasswell was a member of

the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." He also served as a consultant to William Benton in the State Department and had an office there.⁶⁶ In addition, he was a consultant for the Department of Justice, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Office of War Information.⁶⁷

Conducting analyses of "the press" similar to Lasswell's were three men on the payroll of the Federal Communications Commission: Professor Frederick L. Schuman, formerly of the University of Chicago, who belonged to one of the most extensive groupings of Communist-front organizations in the government indexes of persons connected with that type of activity, and more recently was a member of the platform committee of Henry A. Wallace's "Progressive" party; Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd Jr. The latter two were fired from government service by an act of Congress on the recommendation of the House appropriations committee, which found them unfit for government service because of association with men and groups "whose aims and purposes were subversive to this government."⁶⁸

The boss of this program and "war time director of the foreign broadcast intelligence service of the Federal Communications Commission"⁶⁹ was Robert D. Leigh, who was director of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," in charge of its staff. Leigh, who was a visiting professor at the University of Chicago some years ago, currently is the director of the "Public Library Inquiry" of the Social Science Research Council, in charge of spending a \$75,000 annual grant from the council.⁷⁰

During the first ten years of its life, the Social Science Research Council received more than \$4,000,000 from the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Commonwealth Fund, the Falk Foundation, the General Education (Rockefeller) Board, the Spelman (Rockefeller) Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and the Russell Sage Foundation.⁷¹

One of the most important men in the spending of foundation money was Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co., New York, former chairman of the New York Federal Reserve Board, and a member of the "Commission on

Freedom of the Press." Ruml formerly was a professor at the University of Chicago and dean of the university's social science division under Chancellor Hutchins. He is on the board of Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, headed by Benton and Hutchins.⁷² He is a director of Muzak Corporation, another of Benton's ventures.⁷³ He was an official of the Carnegie Corporation, a trustee of the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and directed the giving of the Laura Spelman (Rockefeller) Memorial when it donated millions to the so-called "social sciences."⁷⁴ Horace Coon, in his book, *Money to Burn*, wrote that "wherever the Rockefeller interests have made contributions to the social sciences, Beardsley Ruml's name is usually to be found."⁷⁵ Ruml, along with George Shuster, president of Hunter College, another member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," was a member of the American National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.⁷⁶ Archibald MacLeish, another member of the "commission," was chairman of the American delegation of UNESCO. William Benton, who followed MacLeish into the State Department, followed him likewise into this chairmanship. Shuster also was chairman of the Institute of International Education, president of which was Lawrence Duggan, who plunged to his death mysteriously after his name came up in the congressional investigation of the Communist spy ring in which Alger Hiss, head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, testified.

Shuster, in addition, is president of the World Student Service Fund, a foundation with capital assets of \$576,533.⁷⁷ Chairman of this fund is Reinhold Niebuhr, another member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."⁷⁸ Niebuhr was the beneficiary of a Rockefeller Foundation exchange of professors in 1943 which sent him to England and brought to the United States Sir William Beveridge, author of the English "cradle to the grave" social security plan.⁷⁹

Another member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" is Professor Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago, who was a trustee of the Spelman (Rockefeller) Fund at the time Beardsley Ruml was directing the spending of Rockefeller millions in the "social sciences,"⁸⁰ was president of the So-

cial Science Research Council,⁸¹ and was one of the fathers of the National Resources Planning Board, which was headed by Louis Brownlow, a friend of Merriam's, to which \$3,953,000 in Spelman and Rockefeller funds has been contributed for "public planning" projects.⁸²

Professor John M. Clark of Columbia University was a consultant of the Merriam-Brownlow National Resources Planning Board.⁸³ He was also a member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." He served, along with Chancellor Hutchins, chairman of the "commission," as an official of the National Recovery Administration, the first true attempt to introduce a Fascist business regime into the American economy.⁸⁴ Professor Clark also was a frequent lecturer in economics at the University of Chicago, and spent a full seven years there.⁸⁵

Still another member of the "commission" was Professor Hocking of Harvard, the "philosopher." He is an associate of the Institute of Pacific Relations, on the board of which were Henry Luce and Henry A. Wallace.⁸⁶ This "institute" receives from \$130,000 to \$230,000 a year from the Rockefeller Foundation, and about \$30,000 a year from the Carnegie Corporation.⁸⁷ The Carnegie Corporation gave it \$262,000 from 1941 to 1947.⁸⁸ The 1948 California legislative investigating committee listed the Institute of Pacific Relations as among "typical mass organizations that are the victims of Communist domination."⁸⁹

The only members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" not accounted for so far in this listing are Professors Dickinson, Redfield, and Schlesinger. Professor Dickinson of the University of Pennsylvania is listed as a "member of the corporation" of the Social Science Research Council⁹⁰ and so is Professor Redfield of the University of Chicago, who also held office in this organization as a member of the "committee on fellowships," which gives out the money, and the "committee on social science personnel."⁹¹ Professor Schlesinger of Harvard likewise was a member of the Social Science Research Council, representing the American Historical Association.⁹² It is also interesting to note that in their younger days Professor Redfield and Professor Lasswell of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," and Professor Schuman, their old colleague

at the University of Chicago now identified with Henry Wallace's platform committee, all got fellowships from the Social Science Research Council.⁹³

All of these activities, very possibly, are legal and there are some people, no doubt, who would consider them praiseworthy. They do, however, place every single member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" with feet or hands or both in one of the greatest troughs of untaxed wealth in the history of mankind. The fact that they may not own this wealth in the capitalist sense is of little importance, for they and their friends have full and free access to it and direction of it, and ownership, in the practical sense, means precisely that and nothing else. Furthermore, they repeat and give credence to the opinion that men in private industry, business managers and managing editors, who are employes and not owners of newspapers, are biased by contact with wealth.

(2)

The question naturally arises whether the gigantic, multi-million-dollar "public business" in which these critics engage is so clean and selfless that they are morally entitled to cry "bias" upon a smaller, private industry, such as the newspapers. The readers are entitled to know what these professors have been doing with the public money, which they never earned, and which has been placed beyond reach of the tax collector. The facts which follow will bring out a few examples, although a thorough analysis of the matter would require a separate book in itself, or probably three or four volumes.

Our first case study concerns a top-ranking alien, deported as a Communist, who walked off with \$20,160 of Rockefeller Foundation money which was virtually pushed into his hands by a professor, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, then president of the New School for Social Research in New York. He was Johannes or Hanns Eisler, Austrian composer of the "Comintern March" and other tunes in the *Red Song Book*, and brother of Gerhardt Eisler, named as Comintern agent for the United States and chief of Communist spy activities.⁹⁴ The Eisler story, as it came out

in congressional committee hearings, embarrassed not only the foundations and the "liberal" cult in the higher learning, but the state department and the New Deal administration right up to the White House.

Dr. Johnson, who is now director emeritus of the New School for Social Research, was the managing editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, on the board of editors of which was Professor Merriam of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." This was another venture heavily supported by the foundations, particularly the Carnegie Foundation.⁹⁵ It is regarded as an ultimate source in many phases of the social sciences and is a work to be found in every school library with pretensions to adequacy. The "Commission on Freedom of the Press" insists that private newspapers ought to be "common carriers" of ideas and be objective. Surely, encyclopedias ought to be objective, particularly when they are published with grants of public funds. But here is how the professors "accept the responsibilities of common carriers of information and discussion"⁹⁶ when they have charge of the editing.

Dr. Ludwig von Mises, the famous economist, has correctly noted the article on *laissez faire*, or free, competitive economy, in this encyclopedia is written by a violent British socialist. That is not all. The article on *Communism* is written by Max Beer, one of the most devoted apostles of Karl Marx and his doctrines in the whole history of Communism.⁹⁷ The article on *socialism* is written by Oscar Jaszi, a prominent Hungarian Socialist. The article on *liberty* is written by Harold J. Laski, late British Socialist and former chairman of the Labor party, in whose lexicon "liberty" and "tyranny" were virtually synonyms. As if this were not enough, the article on *capitalism* was turned over to the late Werner Sombart, a former Marxist who managed to get himself so closely identified with the Nazis that anything he might say in defense of the subject is very nicely tainted.⁹⁸

Ordinary honesty and lack of bias, which educators are supposed to possess, would dictate that if the encyclopedia was going to contain articles on *socialism* and *Communism* written, respectively, by a Socialist and a Communist, then the articles

on *liberty* and *capitalism* ought to be written by a true believer in liberty (not a Socialist) and by a true believer in capitalism who was an American and beyond the touch of any militant European ideologies.

Dr. Johnson, who was managing editor of this encyclopedia, was associated with numerous other foundation-financed projects, not the least of which was the Common Council for American Unity, where he served on the editorial board.⁹⁹ Between 1913 and 1922, the Common Council for American Unity received grants of \$203,787 from the Carnegie Corporation, and from 1941 to 1947 it got \$283,000.¹⁰⁰ The organization published a magazine called *Common Ground*, the editor of which was Louis Adamic. Another member of the editorial board was Langston Hughes, the Negro poet. Both Hughes and Adamic are "well known Communists," according to official government reports,¹⁰¹ and the latter boasts a medal received from Marshal Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia.¹⁰² Some of the Carnegie grants were specifically earmarked for "support of *Common Ground*."¹⁰³

Langston Hughes presents an interesting case study of the way the big foundations, in the hands of the educators, spend their money. He has been living off foundation fellowships for a good part of his life. Hughes is described in congressional reports as a "card-holding member of the Communist party,"¹⁰⁴ and his best-known poem is entitled *Goodbye Christ*. Among other things, it urges Jesus to "beat it on away from here now," and to "make way for . . . Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, Worker Me."¹⁰⁵

Reports of the \$20,000,000 Julius Rosenwald Fund disclose that Langston Hughes got at least two fellowships, said to average around \$1,500, one prior to 1938, and one in 1940-42.¹⁰⁶ Chancellor Hutchins of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" was a trustee of the Julius Rosenwald Fund during this period and its reports disclose his name as being listed in the same volumes with that of Langston Hughes. Hughes also got a fellowship from the Guggenheim Foundation. Professor Redfield of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" was a member of the advisory board of this foundation until May, 1946.¹⁰⁷

The Rosenwald Fund, which has disbursed its major assets, according to the terms of the founder's will, and is now in process of liquidation, has a record of contributing preponderantly to persons and projects far to the left, politically. Careful examination of the slender reports it has chosen, from time to time, to make public fails to disclose any notable exceptions of people and projects definitely and militantly non-Communist and non-Socialist getting any of its millions. This bias is extremely interesting in light of the criticism of "bias" which has been directed toward newspapers by Chancellor Hutchins, who was a Rosenwald trustee for at least six years. The fund was supposed to be expended for "education and betterment of race relations," but in the hands of the leftists and the left-wing propagandists a distressingly large portion of the millions has gone to the cause of fanning class and racial hatred rather than brotherly love. Dr. J. W. Holley, Negro educator, author, and founder of Albany (Ga.) State College for Negroes, named the Rosenwald Fund as one of the principal agencies through which members of his race are being taught to "hate the white man."¹⁰⁸ The Rosenwald Fund has helped to disseminate books or pamphlets by Carey McWilliams, dubbed "a hammer-and-sickle on . . . any new front";¹⁰⁹ by Howard Fast, former associate editor of the Communist weekly, *New Masses*, who was given a jail term and fined for contempt of Congress for refusing to turn over records of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee;¹¹⁰ by Maxwell Stewart, propagandist for the Public Affairs Committee who taught in Moscow,¹¹¹ and by the aforementioned Common Council for American Unity.¹¹²

The Rosenwald Fund also has contributed money to the American Veterans Committee, which it defends in glowing words of tribute, as having a "program which recognizes a democratic America as the continuing goal of those who fought to defend democracy."¹¹³ The facts tell a very different story about the American Veterans Committee. It contained a militant minority of young radicals, some leaders of which formed the Communist core of the O.S.S., *Stars and Stripes*, and other branches of the army during World War II. One of them was John Gates, member of the central committee of the Com-

munist party and editor of the *Daily Worker*, convicted with other party leaders for conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the United States government by force and violence.¹¹⁴

In the post-war enthusiasm, many young veterans joined the American Veterans Committee, unaware of its political prejudices—which led it to give official endorsement to Henry A. Wallace in the 1948 political campaign—and of its leadership. From a top enrollment of about 100,000, its membership slumped to fewer than 30,000 by 1949. The University of Chicago has a very active AVC post. It is worth noting that the Rosenwald Fund has never contributed any money to the American Legion or to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, both of which have well-established educational and civic programs.

Another Rosenwald project, to which it contributed an undisclosed sum of money, is the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.¹¹⁵ Official government citations describe this as “a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate” and “a Communist front organization ‘which seeks to attract Southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South’ although its ‘professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist party in the United States.’”¹¹⁶

Still another Rosenwald Fund enterprise is Bethune College, a Negro institution at Daytona Beach, Florida, to which it gave \$9,000.¹¹⁷ The General Education Board, a separate Rockefeller Foundation capitalized at \$16,000,000, also gave this institution \$40,000.¹¹⁸ There are many worthy Negro schools in the South but this particular one is distinguished chiefly by the name of its founder and president, now emeritus, Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, another of those people officially listed in government reports as among “well known Communists.”¹¹⁹ In describing its grant, the Rosenwald Fund reported it was very selective about gifts to “private colleges,” supporting “only those institutions which gave promise of exceptional service in setting standards and in continuing to influence the general stream of public

education."¹²⁰ A more succinct statement of propaganda purpose, in any foundation report, would be hard to find.

Mrs. Bethune is a member of the board of directors of the American Council on Race Relations, an outright propaganda organization bent on influencing legislation and swaying public opinion, which is handsomely financed by the foundations, including the Rosenwald Fund, which, according to public law regulating eleemosynary funds held in trust, cannot engage in propaganda or attempts to influence legislation without forfeiting tax exemption.

The American Council on Race Relations brings the discussion back to the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," for Professor Redfield, one of its members, serves on the council board with Mrs. Bethune. So did Edwin R. Embree, late president of the Rosenwald Fund and vice-president of the Rockefeller Foundation, who, so the story goes, was chief emissary of Julius Rosenwald when he was trustee of the University of Chicago, and was one of the men most directly responsible for installing Mr. Hutchins as president and later chancellor of that institution. Louis Adamic is another director of the American Council on Race Relations. So is Charles Dollard, the president of the Carnegie Corporation.¹²¹

The Carnegie Corporation, which in its reports has said it is "not free to undertake" propaganda, is one of the chief supporters of Louis Adamic, who is the leading propagandist for Tito Communism in the United States. Adamic, as has been noted, is a director of the American Council on Race Relations. Like Langston Hughes, Adamic has received grant after grant from the big foundations, both personally and for projects in which he is interested.

Like Langston Hughes, Adamic was given a Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship, worth about \$2,500. On this money, he spent a year abroad, after which he wrote a book, *The Native's Return*.¹²² Despite the fact that this book, written in 1932, was more than ten years outdated, the New Deal and left-wing elements who obtained bullet-proof jobs in the information-education branches of the army picked it up and purchased 50,000 copies of it for circulation to troops abroad.

Adamic got \$500 additional royalties from the federal treasury by this gesture. The book was denounced in Congress as menacing to the morale of the fighting men.¹²³

Adamic got money from at least two other big foundations to pay his expenses while writing other such books. He was awarded a "grant-in-aid" in 1937 by the Rockefeller Foundation, which has said it does not give to "individuals." Outside of his three-year tenure as a student in the Lyublyana gymnasium (a junior college) in Yugoslavia, Adamic has never had any degree from an institution of higher learning except for an honorary degree he picked up in 1941 from Temple University.¹²⁴ The Carnegie Corporation, which has admitted it would be violation of income tax exemption if it should engage in propaganda, paid for three more of Adamic's books.

In 1940, the Carnegie Corporation paid Adamic a "grant-in-aid" out of its \$96,176.43 fund for that purpose to write *From Many Lands*. In 1942, it paid him two "grants-in-aid" to write *Two-Way Passage* and *What's Your Name?*¹²⁵ All of these books were published commercially and Adamic benefited from the royalties. He already was an established author, receiving royalties from his earlier books. He was writing popular works, having nothing to do with scholarship. Why he should have been singled out for foundation grants and extra largess is something ideology explains in much more precise terms than do the words of the Carnegie Corporation, which said:

"The recipients are, however, not always academic and some of the most interesting results have been achieved in the case of writers and others who have some important idea to develop, but who cannot take the time to do so without a guarantee of at least part of their normal earning capacity. Two of the year's best books for the general public, Van Wyck Brooks' *New England: Indian Summer* and Louis Adamic's *From Many Lands*, were made possible through such grants."¹²⁷

It may strike some people as odd that foundation grants had to be given to two people who were hardly in need of guarantees of their "normal earning capacity," while writing books. Adamic already was the author of a "best seller" and could

afford to spend his time freely in organizing and helping to direct some of the Communist-front movements promoting the cause of Marshal Tito among Americans of Balkan descent during this period. Van Wyck Brooks, three or four years before, had written the "best seller," *The Flowering of New England*, which earned him at least \$60,000 in royalties.

It is also singular that the Carnegie Corporation singled out two men of the same general ideological persuasion for this largess. Louis Adamic, as has been noted, is closely identified with Balkan Communism. Van Wyck Brooks, while he is an unchallenged literary craftsman, is an admitted Socialist who had managed to affiliate himself with twenty-four Communist fronts up to 1944, and many more since then. Among other organizations on the roster of which his name is to be found are the National Council of American Soviet Friendship, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and the League of American Writers, all classified by former Attorney General Clark as "Communist and subversive."

No one recognizes more clearly than the author that writers must eat. The subsidizing of books, either privately, as through an advance on royalties, or by foundations and eleemosynary organizations, on the whole is a benefit to the society, and without it fewer books would be written. The quarrel here is not with the "system." It is with the particular foundations which are financing the writing of pro-Communist propaganda with money held in public trust for the people of the United States, under circumstances which appear suspiciously close to a violation of their charters. Why should any of this public money go to Communists or to pro-Communist political propaganda, when the aim of the Communist movement, documented indisputably in its own official statements, is the overthrow of the United States government by force and violence? The guilty foundations might plead a case, of a sort, if they could prove they had produced an equal number of books, and given an equal amount of money to produce conservative, pro-American, "right-wing" propaganda. But such is not the case. What writer who favored the late General Draja Mihailovich over Marshall Tito was ever given a Carnegie grant to write a book

offsetting some of the poisonous pro-Soviet propaganda about the Balkans Louis Adamic has written? Where in the social science programs of the big foundations such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Rosenwald are the subsidized books giving a brilliant defense of capitalism, private enterprise, American nationalism, and the economic principles of the pre-Willkie Republican party? Even if the foundations could produce them, they would not be exculpated. The financing of propaganda with money held in public trust is not lawful, whether it is conservative or Communistic. Doubly damning to the administrators of these public funds is the fact that even so much as a dollar of them has gone to the support of Communist propaganda, which has as its ultimate aim nothing less than sedition and treason, and is so defined in the laws of several states.

The Carnegie Corporation is not the only big foundation engaged in financing such books and subsidizing such writers. The Rockefeller General Education Board, a separate \$16,000,000 foundation, regularly contributes to the same general cause, although it modestly avers "the Board does not entertain requests . . . to support propaganda."¹²⁸

In the same year the Carnegie Corporation gave grants-in-aid to finance two of Adamic's books, it gave a similar grant to Leo C. Rosten to write a book called *Hollywood*.¹²⁹ Rosten is another whose material needs and cares have been considerably lightened by the big foundations. He got a previous grant from the Social Science Research Council, joint spending agency for Rockefeller and Carnegie money, to spend sixteen months in Washington, writing a book called *The Washington Correspondents*.¹³⁰ The preface of this work says:

"It gives me genuine pleasure to acknowledge the encouragement and guidance of Professor Charles E. Merriam, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Chicago. Many discussions with and suggestions from Professor Harold D. Lasswell of the same institution can be acknowledged only in these inadequate words."¹³¹

Professors Merriam and Lasswell, of course, are members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." Rosten claimed that his book was not "a polemical tract" but "an analysis—the

result of sixteen months of investigation in Washington, under a fellowship from the Social Science Research Council of New York."¹³² Under this claim, it is hardly fair for him to remark, as he did, that he found "the most arrant nonsense" in the editorial columns of the Hearst newspapers.¹³³ Such a statement, unaccompanied by any attempt to analyze the kind of "nonsense" which might have been found in the editorial columns of newspapers having different political views is a confession that bias motivated this work, not factual, scientific analysis. The kind of "analysis" Rosten did under this grant of public money, with the "guidance" and "suggestions" of two members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," is of more than passing interest because it illustrates the story of prejudice and incompetence that is masquerading as scholarship in America, financed by the foundation millions. *The Washington Correspondents* was published in 1937, ten years before the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" brought out its reports, also paid for by other people's money.

Rosten, although he spent sixteen months in Washington, used the mails to conduct a modified sort of Gallup poll of the newspaper men working there, entitling it "the attitudes and preferences of 107 Washington correspondents." Why the job could not have been done for a few dollars from Chicago, New York, or wherever Rosten lived, without the window dressing of "social science" and a fellowship, is not explained. He sent the correspondents statements such as "I believe that 'rugged individualism' is the best economic philosophy today," to which a majority answered "No"; and some "form of government regulation over big business has become imperative," to which a majority answered "Yes."

Just what this proves, unless it is that a majority of the Washington newspaper men Rosten "analyzed" were left-wingers rather than conservatives is not clear. He mailed questionnaires to 127 of them and got back 107 replies.¹³⁴ His methods weren't very democratic, for there were 509 regularly accredited Washington correspondents on the roster of the congressional press gallery, to say nothing of the radio commentators and reporters. Rosten went on to report that a majority of his minority thought

"the press devotes too much space to trivialities; scandals, sensations, divorces, etc.," and that a lesser number of the minority—not quite fifty per cent—thought the news columns were less fair to labor than to "big business."¹³ It may very well be that many other Americans agree with one or more of the conclusions Rosten has tabulated. They may think that newspapers devote too much space to crime and scandal, and they may disagree with the editorial policy of certain newspapers. But, undoubtedly, there are just as many thinking Americans who believe the opposite, who feel along with Joseph Pulitzer that the exposure of crime and scandal by newspapers is a social service that helps to exterminate those evils and put the culprits in great fear, and who enjoy the editorial policy of the particular newspapers in question.

It also may be true that in the realm of the so-called "social sciences," the basing of conclusions on the opinion of one out of five persons is considered to be a "fair sampling." The fallacy here lies in the method itself. The conclusions Rosten reported from this survey were dignified as "science," and therefore supposed to have great weight. But, in truth, what does the opinion of 107 Washington correspondents out of 509 amount to? They are unidentified, personally, and certainly carry no more authority on matters of economic theory and newspaper practice than a group of editorial workers in any other large city. In addition, Rosten, through his selective technique, had the opportunity to load his statistics in favor of his own economic and political beliefs by picking opinions from people likely to agree with him. No one who has made an objective study of the methods of the "social sciences" will be naïve enough to believe he did not do it. If Rosten had obtained 20 or 30 answers from correspondents in the Hearst organization and International News Service in Washington, he would not have got a condemnation of Hearst editorial pages, or a majority of his minority condemning "rugged individualism." This is not to say that all Hearst editorial workers agree with the newspaper's editorial policy; it only points up the danger to truth from generalizing upon selected opinions, and demonstrates how closely akin to phrenology, where bumps on the head are

measured instead of opinions, are the measuring methods of the "social sciences." Nonetheless, "social scientists" such as Professors Redfield, Merriam, and Lasswell of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," the latter two having helped Rosten, are devoted apostles of the "measuring" cult which uses a two-foot yardstick. The multi-million-dollar foundations pay big money for this kind of thing, and one has only to examine the foundation reports of grants and fellowships to see the same old, familiar names appearing over and over again—people identified with economic and political conviction rather than honest search for truth, whatever their academic standing. While there will be no attempt here to generalize, surely there must be hundreds of university and college professors in America who do not have a pro-Communist, internationalist bias, who do not revere the Roosevelt-New Deal domestic and foreign policy as tablets brought down from Mount Sinai, and who need help in their research and writing. The writer has reviewed hundreds of foundation-financed tracts, pamphlets, books, and theses, and except for medical research, dissertations on Egyptology, Polynesian poetry, and the like, has yet to find, in any politically influential work, the handiwork of such an author.

Rosten got a Social Science Research Council Fellowship, and so did John Victor Murra, an instructor in anthropology at the University of Chicago and student of Professor Redfield, of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." A year after Murra had spent his \$2,000 fellowship grant a United States District Court judge refused his petition for American citizenship after introduction of evidence from United States Army intelligence, backed up by records of his own activities on the university campus and elsewhere.¹⁸⁶ Murra was a native of Russia who had fought in the Communist brigade in the Spanish revolution. He admitted this, but denied he was a Communist. The Social Science Research Council is the agency of the big foundations with which so many members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" have been connected—Redfield, Merriam, Dickinson, Schlesinger, Ruml, MacLeish, and Leigh.

Fellowships of the same sort are granted by the \$20,000,000

Guggenheim Foundation, of which Louis Adamic and Langston Hughes were beneficiaries. Guggenheim has made some very interesting personal grants.

Otto Klineberg, who got Carnegie help on books, was a Guggenheim Fellow. So was Granville Hicks, ex-member of the Communist party.¹³⁷ So was Maurice Hindus, who is quoted as an authority in Dean Hewlett Johnson's Communist book, *Soviet Power*.¹³⁸ So was Richard Wright, said by a legislative investigating body to be a Communist party member.¹³⁹ So were Alvin E. Hansen, the New Deal economist; Mordecai Ezekiel, the early New Deal associate of Henry A. Wallace, and Paul Douglas, the "liberal" professor at the University of Chicago, who became a United States Senator. So was Carey McWilliams, the California lawyer, whom legislative reports list as "a hammer-and-sickle on . . . any new front."¹⁴⁰ So was Jack Conroy, a teacher at the Communist Workers School in Chicago.¹⁴¹ This is not to say that all Guggenheim fellows are Communists or fellow travelers, but the frequency with which left-wing applicants have been able to gather in these fellowships in the last ten to fifteen years transcends coincidence. Carey McWilliams writes pamphlets for the foundation-supported Institute of Pacific Relations, of which Professor Hocking of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" is a director. So does Maxwell S. Stewart, one-time editor of the *Moscow Daily News*, now extinct organ of the Kremlin.¹⁴² Both McWilliams and Stewart write pamphlets for the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., of which Stewart is the editor. This committee receives money from three foundations.¹⁴³

The Public Affairs pamphlets also have been devoted to spreading the doctrines of Morris Ernst, Harold L. Ickes, and the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." Robert E. Cushman, professor of government at Cornell university, wrote one called *Keep Our Press Free!*, which has a capsule-sized digest of left-wing doctrines, including the absolutely false statement that in the United States "one company controls about 3,000 weeklies."¹⁴⁴ For further reading on the subject, the pamphlet directs those interested to books by Ernst, Ickes, and the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."¹⁴⁵ This same Cushman, in

1947, was the beneficiary of a \$110,000 Rockefeller Foundation grant for the "Studies of civil liberties, and the control of subversive activities." This was a left-wing attempt to attack "the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities." One of Professor Cushman's principal assistants in this supposedly *unbiased* inquiry is Professor Walter F. Gellhorn, of Columbia, who is a well-known enemy of the House Committee, was a member of several Communist fronts, and a man who appeared as a defiant and unfriendly witness before the committee he is now supposed to evaluate with "scholarly" and "scientific" objectivity.¹⁴⁶

The "Commission on Freedom of the Press" demands that private newspapers be "common carriers" of ideas and opinions, yet these publications, financed by huge sums of tax-exempt foundation money, do not present any "common carrier." The ideas in them are predominantly left-wing, ranging from New Deal to pro-Soviet, and very few with a capitalist, conservative, or pro-American viewpoint are given access to these pages to challenge the facts or statements by the left wingers or to present opinions. It should be remembered that the members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" are closely identified with the spending of this foundation money, and with the organizations which produce this kind of literature.

Three questions arise from this. First, why should the professors and ex-professors who formed the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" demand of others an impartiality which they and the organizations with which they are identified refuse to exercise? Second, why should tax-exempt funds, held in public trust, be used to finance any propaganda work of a political or economic nature, no matter what it is? Third, where is the integrity of scholarship, the "search for truth," which these professors and the big foundations both claim as their justification for existence? Is a left-wing bias which refuses to confront the facts any more desirable than a conservative bias, which the "commission" falsely imputes to all American newspapers? No reasonable person would object to foundation-financed publications printing the arguments and appeals of the Communists if an *equal* amount of pro-American fact and

opinion were included in the same issue or same series of issues. Here is the place to try out the "common carrier" idea, for the money which pays for these publications is held in public trust and certainly should not be the exclusive bankroll of a minority of so-called intellectuals. This is money which ought to be spent, if it is spent that way at all, on presenting the views of all of the people—not just those professors who hold the purse strings. If the professors want an exclusive editorial page for their views, let them invest their own money, as newspaper publishers do, instead of using funds bequeathed to the betterment of all citizens for the purpose.

Another propaganda organization heavily financed by the big foundations is the Foreign Policy Association, which publishes a series of booklets giving voice to the opinions of such confirmed left-wingers as Max Lerner, the former editorial writer for *PM*. The Rockefeller Foundation gave the Foreign Policy Association \$362,000 between 1941 and 1947,¹⁴⁷ while the Carnegie Corporation gave it \$75,000 during the same period.¹⁴⁸

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace recently was headed by Alger Hiss, named in sworn testimony in a federal court room as a dues-paying member of the Communist party and as a Communist spy who filched confidential State Department papers for transmission to the Soviet. Hiss denied this, but was convicted on two counts of perjury, one based on his sworn denial to a grand jury on December 15, 1948, that either he or his wife abstracted the papers and gave them to Whittaker Chambers, an admitted Soviet spy, and the other based on his sworn denial that he or his wife ever saw Chambers after January 1, 1937. To support his charge that Hiss was his confederate in espionage, Chambers produced stolen documents dated in January, February, and March, 1938. This foundation has close connections with some of the organizations just discussed. It distributes the booklets of the Foreign Policy Association and the Institute of Pacific Relations.¹⁴⁹ It also distributed a book by the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."¹⁵⁰ This \$11,000,000 public trust was in the propaganda business long before Hiss took it over, although it is exempt

from federal taxes because, partly, it is supposed not to engage in propaganda.

This foundation, operating under slogans of "peace," which brought it out openly in favor of United States entrance in two World Wars, is the leader of what is sometimes called the America-last movement in international politics. For thirty-five years it has devoted its millions to building the kind of internationalist opinion in the United States which coincides with the foreign policy of Great Britain and France. The Carnegie Endowment was one of the most powerful propaganda organizations supporting the 3½-billion-dollar British gift-loan which preceded the Marshall plan, printing in its 1946 *Yearbook* a congratulatory letter from the state department for its "public education" in behalf of that particular project.¹⁵¹

Propaganda apparently becomes "public education" when you agree with it. The same *Yearbook* reported that the Carnegie Endowment had distributed to its "international mind alcoves" and to "international relations clubs" in high schools and universities copies of *The People of the Soviet Union*, by Corliss Lamont. Lamont was a lecturer in the Jefferson School of Social Science, the Communist party school in New York City, and has been affiliated with a host of Communist front organizations.¹⁵² Among speakers the Carnegie Endowment has presented on its radio programs is Archibald MacLeish, a member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."¹⁵³ Another was Harlow Shapley, the Harvard astronomer who headed the 1949 Communist gathering of the National Conference of Arts, Sciences, and Professions in New York City's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, and who has been extremely active in Communist fronts.¹⁵⁴ Still another was Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, popularly known as the "collectivist" Bishop of the Methodist Church, who has a record of participation in Communist fronts in America unequalled by any other Methodist parson, with the possible exception of Dr. Harry F. Ward.¹⁵⁵ Beardsley Ruml, another member of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," took part in the endowment-sponsored meeting of political scientists, the same *Yearbook* noted.¹⁵⁶

Alger Hiss was ushered into the presidency of the Carnegie

Endowment with special flourishes which were not accorded to his predecessor, Nicholas Murray Butler. All Dr. Butler got out of it was a lavish expense account, which enabled him to make regular pilgrimages to his beloved France and England under the excuse of probing the sentiments of the "international mind." But for Mr. Hiss, the Endowment created a special job with a salary of \$20,000 a year, plus the expense account. Hiss withdrew from the endowment in 1949. At the same time Mr. Hiss was elevated to this office—May 9, 1946—John Foster Dulles, the internationalist lawyer and personal friend of Hiss, was made chairman of the Endowment Board. The 1947 report of the Endowment secretary said:

"The selection of Mr. Dulles as chairman of the board and of Mr. Hiss as president of the Endowment serves to emphasize the decision of the trustees to concentrate the Endowment's efforts as much as possible upon the success of the United Nations as the instrument best adapted at the present time to promote the purposes for which the Endowment was founded."¹⁵⁷

Along with propagandizing for the United Nations, the Endowment under Mr. Hiss was able to get in a few items favorable to the Soviet among the books it distributed, including the Lamont book and *The Soviet Union Today; An Outline Study*, put out by the American Russian Institute, which has been cited as a Communist front by several legislative inquiries.¹⁵⁸

There is, of course, an enormous interlocking between the various pro-Communist activities carried on with the foundation millions in the hands of the professors. One of the foundation-financed Foreign Policy Association *Headline Series* pamphlets, for instance, was written by Professor Philip E. Mosely, professor of international relations at Columbia University's Russian Institute. In it, Professor Mosely said: "Over the long run, great numbers of people will judge both the Soviet and American Systems, not by how much individual freedom they preserve but by how much they contribute, in freedom or without it, to develop a better livelihood and a greater feeling of social fulfillment."¹⁵⁹

This is the straight Communist party ideology—"what is freedom without bread?" Garett Garett, editor of *American Affairs*,

commented: "It means only that pure Communist ideology may be thus imparted by Columbia University's Russian Institute through the Foreign Policy Association."¹⁶⁰ Not only is the Foreign Policy Association foundation-supported, but the Rockefeller Foundation is also responsible for the Russian Institute at Columbia, granting \$250,000 in cash to establish it in 1945.¹⁶¹ It has supported this "institute" handsomely since. It also made a similar large grant to Cornell University to start a Russian Institute there, "for a better understanding of the Slavic world, particularly of the contemporary life of the Soviet Union."¹⁶²

The kind of "democracy" wealthy foundations pay money to define is indicated in the title of a book, *The Pattern of Soviet Democracy*, by G. F. Aleksandrov, a leading Communist "philosopher," which the Rockefeller millions have helped to get translated and circulated in this country. In 1944, the Rockefeller Foundation gave the American Council of Learned Societies \$500,000 to translate some of the latest Soviet writings. It issued its first volume, a treatise by a member of the Politburo, N. A. Voznesensky, about four years later. This book attacked the wartime accomplishments of the United States and Britain. Other such books, including the Aleksandrov volume, are being issued with this money. Undoubtedly it is true that the translation of Russian newspapers and magazines through such a project could serve a useful purpose, telling Americans what the Communists are writing and thinking about us. The opportunities it offers, however, as an avenue of propaganda in the hands of professors who are sympathetic to Communism ought to be apparent—so much so, in this instance, that *Newsweek* magazine reported the result has been that the American Council of Learned Societies has been swamped with requests, particularly from Communist party members in the United States and American leftist leaders, who are eager to find out what the party line really is.¹⁶³

Another organization worthy of special attention was the "Committee for the Marshall Plan," a propaganda group established in New York City in February, 1948, to "sell" the idea of the Marshall Plan and a twenty-billion-dollar donation of

the taxpayers' money for Europe to Congress and to the American people. Here, again, the question at issue is not whether the Marshall Plan is good or bad. It is simply a question of whether money held in public trust by the large foundations ought to be used to propagandize for any partisan political issue.¹⁶⁴

One of the most shocking stories is the manner in which the professors, spending the millions of great foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the General (Rockefeller) Education Board, the Carnegie Corporation, and others, are reaching right down into the public schools, on elementary and grade level, and using these millions in direct indoctrination of the children with outright Communist propaganda. One book for high school use, written by a Communist professor and a left-wing associate and published with foundation assistance by the National Education Association, said:

"Freedom of the press, cinema, radio, and of publishing has to be restored. . . . For instance, limitations might be imposed on the number of journals (or magazines) a single company is allowed to publish on press syndicates. A limitation of investment by a single person or company in these fields may also be useful. The purpose is to reestablish a deconcentrated press, radio, motion picture industry, and publishing business based on competitive private (or cooperative) ownership. . . . Newspapers, radios, and similar industries should also be required to make public their sources of income."¹⁶⁵

The close identity of these last few recommendations, directed toward newspapers, with the doctrines of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" will be apparent to the reader.¹⁶⁶ It is, in fact, just one more item of proof of the common direction of thinking in those circles of the higher learning where the members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" are active and important today.¹⁶⁷

The people who direct this thinking and who influence the spending of this public money, so much of which goes to furthering the Communist, socialist, or "liberal" cause in the United States and elsewhere in the world, are a certain kind of university professors, in the minority perhaps, as to numbers,

but in positions of great power. Let the reader look at the names—Hutchins, Ruml, Merriam, Shuster, Lasswell, MacLeish, Niebuhr—identified with the foundations and their politically directed spending and likewise members of the “Commission on Freedom of the Press.” These are the men who cry “bias” against the free and diversified press of America, the last remaining stronghold of freedom against socialist encroachment of big government. These are the men who have revived the old socialist cry: “Shackle the press to make it free.”

NOTES FOR CHAPTER TEN

1. *A Free and Responsible Press*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
2. *Ibid*, p. 18.
3. *Ibid*, pp. 59, 60.
4. *Appendix IX*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1514-1518.
5. *Soviet Power*, by Hewlett Johnson, International Publishers, New York, 1940, p. 308.
6. *The American Press*, address by William Allen White, *Vital Speeches*, May 15, 1939, p. 455.
7. *Ibid*, p. 455.
8. *Ibid*, p. 455.
9. *A Free and Responsible Press*, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
10. Moody's Manual of Investments, 1948, p. 1776.
11. Standard Corporation Records, Standard & Poor's Corp., New York, Feb. 28, 1949, pp. 334, 335.
12. Moody's, *op. cit.*, p. 710. (See also financial report in Appendix E.)
13. *Ibid*, p. 1657.
14. *Cf. Newsweek*, Aug. 1, 1949, p. 46.
15. *Standard Corporation Records*, *op. cit.*, p. 1520. Moody's, *op. cit.*, p. 2703.
16. *Moody's*, *op. cit.*, p. 2216.
17. *Ibid*, p. 2882.
18. *Ibid*, p. 2197.

19. *Ibid*, p. 1667.
20. *Standard Corporation Records*, *op. cit.*, p. 1520.
21. *The Critique of Political Economy*, by Karl Marx, London, 1859, Vol. I. pp. iv, v.
22. *American Universities and Colleges*, 5th edn., edited by A. J. Brumbaugh, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1948. Financial reports of each institution are listed alphabetically under the institution. Estimates in the case of Harvard, Yale and Princeton property are the author's, based on information from real estate authorities, educators, and others in Boston, New York, Washington, and Chicago.
23. *Statistics of Higher Education, 1943-44*, published by Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, p. 35.
24. See *By-Laws of the University of Chicago*, 1945. The articles of incorporation set forth in this document say specifically that the trustees of the university shall be members of the corporation. There follows the statement that the members of the corporation "shall have no vote of any nature." While the matter has never been brought to legal issue, it seems apparent that the Chancellor is the only person left with a vote.
25. *American Universities and Colleges*, *op. cit.*, p. 416.
26. *Ibid*, p. 289.
27. *Statistics of Higher Education*, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
28. *Ibid*, p. 3.
29. *A Free and Responsible Press*, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
30. *American Universities and Colleges*, *op. cit.*, p. 48. It is not true, however, that the larger universities, as a general rule, make a profit from this billion and a half of government money spent on G. I. education. Administrators of one major middle western university, for instance, told the author that the university must put up \$2 to \$4 out of its own funds for every government dollar spent there on veterans' education. In the smaller colleges, however, where educational costs are lower, this government money frequently has been a windfall.
31. Estimates range from 505 foundations with capital assets of \$1,817,817,299 as given in *American Foundations for Social Welfare*, by Shelby M. Harrison and F. Emerson Andrews, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1946, p. 58, to 700 foundations with capital assets of \$4,000,000,000, as reported in *Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 10, 1940.
32. *Ibid*, *esp.* *American Foundations for Social Welfare*, *op. cit.* p. 58.
33. *American Foundations for Social Welfare*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
34. *Newsweek*, Dec. 27, 1948, p. 68. Introducing a bill in Congress to halt tax exemption to university commercial businesses, Rep. Noah Mason (R., Ill.) remarked that one university is in the race track business and others operate airports and manufacture piston rings to dodge taxes. (*Cf. Chicago Tribune*, June 22, 1949, p. 24.)
35. *A Free and Responsible Press*, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
36. *Ibid*, p. 42.
37. *Ibid*, p. 43.
38. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1946, p. 244.
39. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual report*, 1947, p. 31.
40. Rosenwald Fund, *Review of Two Decades, 1917-36*, by Edwin R. Embree, 1936, p. 2.
41. Carnegie Corporation, *op. cit.*, 1942, p. 15.
42. *Ibid*, 1942, p. 99. See other annual reports, 1941-1947.
43. *Ibid*, 1946, p. 24.
44. *Ibid*, 1942, p. 24.

NOTES

45. *Teacher in America*, by Jacques Barzun, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1945, p. 288.
46. See annual reports of the foundations mentioned, also *Who's Who*. 1948-1949.
47. *American Foundations and their Fields*, 6th survey by Raymond Rich & William Cherin Associates, New York, 1947, p. 15. Also *Who's Who*. 1948-1949.
48. *Ibid*, p. 53.
49. See latest annual reports of these foundations. Also *Who's Who*, 1948-1949.
50. *Who's Who*. Also publications of the Carnegie Endowment.
51. *Who's Who*. Also Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1946-1947.
52. *American Foundations and their Fields*, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
53. *Who's Who*. Also Julius Rosenwald Fund, *Report of the Fund*, 1940-42, p. 38.
54. *Men Who Control our Universities*, by Hubert Park Beck, King's Crown Press, Morningside Heights, New York, 1947, p. 107.
55. Cf. *Money to Burn*, by Horace Coon, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1938, pp. 275-298.
56. A sample of the indoctrination in communism contained in University of Chicago social science courses is found in the *Syllabus and Selected Readings, Social Sciences* 2, September, 1948, University of Chicago Press, Vol. I, pp. 157, 158. The reader will find the full text of it in Appendix C.
57. "Hutchins of Chicago," by Milton Mayer, *Harper's Magazine*, March-April 1939, p. 543.
58. University of Chicago *Announcements, the College and the Divisions*, (catalogue), 1943, p. 2.
59. *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 16, 1948, p. 1.
60. *Ibid*, Nov. 14, 1948, p. 1.
61. *Ibid*, Oct. 19, 1948, p. 3.
62. *Ibid*, Oct. 18, 1948, p. 1.
63. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1942, p. 36.
64. *Ibid*, p. 36.
65. *Ibid*, p. 39.
66. State Department telephone directory, Washington, 1945.
67. *Washington Daily News*, May 20, 1942, news story by Dan Kidney.
68. *Chicago Tribune*, July 14, 1943; Aug. 29, 1943.
69. Advertisement for Leigh's book *Modern Rules of Parliamentary Procedure* on back of dust jacket of the book, *The Public and Its Problems*, by John Dewey, published by Gateway Books, 301 E. 18th St., Chicago.
70. *Report of the Social Science Research Council*, 1946-47, p. 51; *Ibid*, 1945-46, p. 52; *Ibid*, 1946-47, p. 52; Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1945, p. 285.
71. *Money to Burn*, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
72. *Who's Who*, 1948-49.
73. *Ibid*.
74. *Money to Burn*, *op. cit.*, p. 287.
75. *Ibid*, p. 287.
76. *UNESCO and the National Commission, Basic Documents*, Department of State, Publication 3082, March, 1948, p. 16.
77. *American Foundations and their Fields*, *op. cit.*, p. 54; *Chicago Tribune*, Dec. 22, 1948, p. 6.
78. *American Foundations and their Fields*, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
79. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1943, p. 195.
80. *Money to Burn*, *op. cit.*, p. 287; *Who's Who*.

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

81. *Who's Who*.

82. *Congressional Record*, 76th Congress, 3d session, Vol. 86, Part 1, pp. 419, 420. (Cf. Chapter Four.)

83. *Who's Who*.

84. *Who's Who*. The fascist nature of NRA's economic system is demonstrated in its structure—government regulation of business left in private hands. Some of the original members of the Roosevelt "brain trust" during the planning days of NRA told quite frankly of their admiration for Mussolini's system in Italy, many of the ideas of which were borrowed for this American experiment.

85. *Who's Who*.

86. For Hocking, *Ibid*. For Luce and Wallace, *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1947, p. 4.

87. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual report*, 1947, p. 30; Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual reports*, 1941 to 1947, inclusive.

88. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual reports*, 1941 to 1947, inclusive.

89. Fourth report, Un-American Activities in California, 1948, *op. cit.*, pp. 40, 41.

90. Social Science Research Council, *Report*, 1946-47, p. 4.

91. *Ibid*, 1944-1945, pp. 5, 40.

92. *Ibid*, 1941-42, p. 6.

93. *Who's Who*.

94. Hanns Eisler, who left the United States under a deportation agreement, and his brother, Gerhardt, who fled, both are now teaching at a German university in the Russian zone. Hanns was charged with perjury growing out of testimony he gave before a congressional investigating committee. (*Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 7, 1948, p. 21.)

The Rockefeller Foundation, with which so many members of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" have intimate connections, has said that "the Foundation does not make gifts or loans to individuals, or finance patents or altruistic movements involving private profit, or contribute to the building or maintenance of churches, hospitals, or other local organizations, or support campaigns to influence public opinion on any social or political questions, no matter how important or disinterested these questions may be." (Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1941, p. 54.) However pious the denial, this is what happened:

As far back as 1938, the visa division of the American State Department reported that "the evidence establishes preponderantly that [Hanns] Eisler is a Communist, although it does not show that he [presently] is an enrolled member of the Communist party. His beliefs are anti-Nazi and pro-Communist; he has given the Communists in the United States and other countries aid, comfort, and active association in the promotion of their cause." (*Hearings Regarding Hanns Eisler*, 80th Congress, 1st session, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1947, p. 68.) Eisler had been in and out of the United States on an Austrian passport for the previous three years, and was in New York at the time, where he had been working as a "visiting lecturer" at the New School for Social Research.

This institution, where Professor Lasswell and Archibald MacLeish of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" were frequent lecturers and which was the home of Kurt Riezler, a foreign advisor, and Milton D. Stewart, a member of the staff of the "commission," was headed by Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, a former University of Chicago professor who is connected with the Social Science Research Council, the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, and several other ventures. (*Who's Who in America*, 1948-49.) On March 29, 1938, Dr.

NOTES

Johnson offered Eisler a position as professor of music at the New School for Social Research, although Eisler had no academic or scholastic qualifications or standing. Eisler was having trouble getting his non-immigrant visitor's visa renewed, and Dr. Johnson had been fronting for him with various government officials. It was supposed that by changing Eisler's status from "visiting lecturer" to "professor" his chances for remaining permanently in the United States would be improved.

"On June 20, 1938," said the official government proceedings in the matter, "after Dr. Johnson had been in contact with various government officials, as has been brought out in this hearing, and had been advised that Eisler's visa was being held up, he wrote Hanns Eisler. . . . 'I understand that your visa is being held up because you have been boosted by the *Daily Worker* as a "Comrade," that is, as a Communist. I personally have no prejudice against Communists and can see no earthly reason why a good Communist should not be a good musician.' " (Eisler Hearings, *op. cit.*, p. 81.)

Dr. Johnson then wrote to James L. Houghteling, commissioner of the bureau of immigration and naturalization and son-in-law of Frederick A. Delano, uncle of the late President Roosevelt. Delano, incidentally, is a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, headed by Alger Hiss, convicted on two counts of perjury, and is also a trustee of the Russell Sage Foundation and the Carnegie Institute. Dr. Johnson told Houghteling he intended to employ Eisler "as a teacher, primarily of song composition." He said he was aware that native American musicians were having difficulty getting employment and that there was every reason for not employing an alien where an American could be employed. But, he added, "the special fund out of which we should pay his salary would not be available for an American composer even if I knew one who could answer the same purpose." (*Ibid.*, p. 102.)

To this, the visa division of the State Department added the following comment: "It would be interesting to know the source of the funds available to Dr. Johnson, but which are not available for paying the salary of an American composer. If the funds are to be made available only to pay the salary of an alien, what kind of an institution is Dr. Johnson trying to operate in the United States?" (*Ibid.*, p. 102.)

Commissioner Houghteling ruled that Eisler could stay in the United States for the duration of his teaching engagement at the New School for Social Research. This was not at all pleasing to Eisler. He wanted permanent residence here. He and his wife applied for it through the United States consul at Havana, Cuba, and later through the consul in Mexico City. Here, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, related to both Delano and Houghteling, stepped into the picture. She appealed to Sumner Welles, then Acting Secretary of State, writing: "Dear Sumner: This Eisler case seems a hard nut to crack. What do you suggest?" This was the second appeal in Eisler's behalf by Mrs. Roosevelt, then First Lady in the White House. A previous note to Welles was dated January 11, 1939. (*Ibid.*, p. 68.)

As soon as the First Lady started agitation, the State Department promptly changed its mind about Eisler being an undesirable Communist. Thirteen days after the "Dear Sumner" note, George S. Messersmith, Assistant Secretary of State under Sumner Welles, told the Havana consul: "It would seem to me that unless there is a definite and convincing proof that Mr. Eisler does hold opinions which would exclude him his case can be favorably considered from that point of view." (*Ibid.*, pp. 113-114.) Communist or not, Eisler was to be let in if he could give the right answers. He got back to the United States on a temporary visa while strings were being pulled in his behalf in higher New

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

Deal echelons. Dr. Johnson, meanwhile, got the Rockefeller Foundation money for him to make his stay more comfortable and profitable.

"The request for this grant was in the first instance presented orally to Mr. John Marshall, associate director of the humanities division of the Foundation by Dr. Alvin Johnson, director of the New School for Social Research," Raymond B. Fosdick, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, wrote. "The Foundation has long been acquainted with the work of the New School, and while we never contributed to its general support, we have from time to time assisted in the work of particular scholars there." (*Ibid*, pp. 85-86.)

This is the foundation which said it doesn't give money to individuals, and refuses to contribute to local churches or hospitals. The 1940 Annual Report of the Rockefeller Foundation added this comment: "The Foundation made a grant of \$20,160 to the New School for Social Research for experimental studies of music in film production during the two-year period beginning February 1, 1940. These studies are under the direction of Dr. Hanns Eisler, a member of the school's faculty and a well-known composer of music for motion pictures." (Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1940, p. 316.)

Although the Labor Department and the Immigration Service repeatedly attempted to deport Eisler during this period, even swearing out warrants for him which were never served, the "professor" stayed on to spend all but \$185.25 of the Rockefeller Foundation money. He even asked for a "supplementary grant" of \$4,900, but this, according to Mr. Fosdick, the Foundation "declined." The largess of the foundation to the New School for Social Research was not so small as Mr. Fosdick may have implied in his statement. The same foundation report which listed the Eisler grant also listed these appropriations:

"New School for Social Research:

"Study of social and economic controls in Germany and Russia and general research assistance	\$53,000.
"Experimental demonstrations of music in film production (part of Eisler's \$20,160 grant)	\$10,400.
"Study of totalitarian communication in wartime.....	\$15,960.
"Administration of grants to European refugee scholars.....	\$35,000.
"Grant in aid fund for refugee scholars.....	\$2,500."

(*Ibid*, 1941, pp. 350, 356, 361.)

Further inspection of Rockefeller Foundation reports shows that the New School got \$62,535.42 for five projects in 1942, \$37,000 in 1943, and \$14,000 in 1944. (*Ibid*, 1942, 1943, 1944.) The "refugee scholar" racket was a ruse exploited fully by European Communists during the war years, and the Rockefeller Foundation financed it handsomely. As is shown by the Eisler case, the foundation was not at all particular about the people who got this money. If Eisler was so competent as a composer of music for films, the reader may wonder why Hollywood, which is not unfriendly to Communists, did not hire him. The answer is simple and very important. Eisler did work in Hollywood for very short periods. On a visitor's visa, however, he could not take regular employment. He would have been forced to get on the German or Austrian quota list, which was filled. The quickest way to get into the United States is to become a "scholar" or "professor," since immigration laws admit such persons on a non-quota basis, expecting them to contribute to society.

95. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*.

96. This was the first recommendation to "the press" in the "commission's" report. Cf. *A Free and Responsible Press*, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

97. *Plain Talk*, January, 1949, p. 57. Dr. von Mises said: "The *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* may fairly be considered as representative of the

NOTES

doctrines taught at American and British universities and colleges. Its ninth volume contains an article 'Laissez Faire' from the pen of the Oxford professor and author of detective stories, G. D. H. Cole. In the five and a quarter pages of his contribution Professor Cole freely indulges in the use of deprecatory epithets. The maxim 'cannot stand examination,' it is only prevalent in 'popular economics,' it is 'theoretically bankrupt,' an 'anachronism,' it survives only as a 'prejudice,' but 'as a doctrine deserving of theoretical respect it is dead.' Resort to these and many other similar opprobrious appellations fails to disguise the fact that Professor Cole's arguments entirely miss the point. Professor Cole is not qualified to deal with the problems involved because he simply does not know what the market economy is and how it works. The only correct affirmation of his article is the truism that those rejecting laissez faire are Socialists." Regarding Beer, *A Survey of Socialism*, by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

98. *Plain Talk, op. cit.*, p. 61. In this same passage Dr. von Mises pointed out that since Sombart declared the *Fuhrer* "gets his orders directly from God, the Supreme *Fuhrer* of the Universe . . . once you admit these premises you can no longer raise any objections against planning and socialism."

99. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report, 1941*, pp. 23, 66.

100. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual report, 1943*, p. 23; see also reports for other years, 1941 through 1947.

101. 1948 California Joint Fact-Finding Committee report, *op. cit.*, p. 390.

102. *Who's Who*.

103. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report, 1941*, p. 66.

104. House of Representatives, *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, p. 262. Cf also *Report On Civil Rights Congress as a Communist Front Organization*, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 80th Congress, 1st session, Sept. 2, 1947, to Nov. 17, 1947, USGPO, Washington, 1947, which says, p. 15: "Langston Hughes, sponsor of Civil Rights Congress; member, Communist Party, U.S.A.; signer of statement in behalf of Communists George Dimitrov, William Z. Foster, Don West, Benjamin J. Davis Jr.; contributor to the Communist press."

105. 1947 California Joint Fact-Finding Committee report, *op. cit.*, p. . .

106. Rosenwald Fund, *Review for 1940-42, op. cit.*, p. 24; *Ibid*, 1944-46, p. 21; *Ibid*, 1917-36, p. 35; *Ibid*, 1938-40, p. 21, 22.

107. John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Report of the secretary and treasurer, 1941-42, p. 2.

108. *Chicago Tribune*, Feb. 4, 1949, p. 3. Dr. Holley explained that the "hate" campaign is being conducted through a theme that whites are taking away the rights of Negroes. He protested "the rape of my race by the northern press and other organizations," naming the Rosenwald Fund particularly.

109. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1942-1944, op. cit.*, p. 36; 1947 California report, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

110. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1942-1944, op. cit.*, p. 38; *Chicago Tribune*, June 28, 1947; July 17, 1947; April 25, 1949.

111. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1942-1944, op. cit.*, p. 39; *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1947, p. 4.

112. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1942-1944 op. cit.*, p. 40.

113. *Ibid*, 1944-1946, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

114. *New Leader*, Nov. 27, 1948, p. 3.

115. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1944-1946, op. cit.*, p. 15.

116. *Citations by Official Government Agencies, op. cit.*, 1948, p. 90.

117. Rosenwald Fund *Review, 1917-1936, op. cit.*, p. 28.

118. General Education Board, *Annual Report, 1946*, p. 43.

119. 1948 California report, *op. cit.*, p. 390.

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

120. Rosenwald Fund *Review*, 1917-1936, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

121. The president of the American Council on Race Relations is Louis Wirth, a social science professor at the University of Chicago who has promoted the Socialist cause on several university-sponsored radio programs. (Cf. University of Chicago *Round Table of the Air*, No. 505, Nov. 23, 1947; No. 511, Jan. 4, 1948.) The executive director is A. A. Liveright, another University of Chicago professor who was a member of the Civil Rights Congress, held by Attorney General Clark to be "subversive." (*Report on Civil Rights Congress as a Communist Front Organization*, by the House Committee on Un-American activities, 80th Congress, 1st session, Sept. 2, 1947, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1947, p. 23; *Citations, op. cit.*, p. 26.) The director of community services is Robert C. Weaver, frequently mentioned in government reports for affiliations with Communist fronts. (*Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 263, 266, 1280, 1347, 1783, for example.) The vice-president is Will W. Alexander, a former vice-president of the Rosenwald Fund. Alexander was administrator of the Farm Security Administration in the early Roosevelt New Deal and was named by Lauchlin Currie, executive assistant to the late President, as one of the persons Currie saw on social occasions at the home of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, accused in connection with Communist spy ring activities. (*Hearings Regarding Communist Espionage in the United States Government*, 80th Congress, 2nd session, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1948, pp. 857, 870.) One witness said Communists photographed secret government documents in the basement of Silvermaster's home, although Silvermaster refused to answer the charges. (*Ibid.*, p. 593.)

The American Council on Race Relations occupies former Rosenwald Fund premises near the University of Chicago. It is a major clearing house for "organizations concerned with minority group problems." (Official Pamphlet of the American Council on Race Relations, undated.) Two of the major activities of the American Council on Race Relations are listed in its literature as follows:

"Legislation, Administration and Public Policy—continuation of coordinated efforts to extend civil liberties and rights through improved legislation and more effective administration and public interpretation.

"Public Opinion and Mass Communication—cooperation with and service to the press, radio and other mass communication media to make available to the public more adequate information concerning minorities and to develop a climate of opinion more conducive to democratic solution of minority problems." (*Ibid.*)

These statements are an open admission that this foundation-financed organization has as its major aims the influencing of legislation and the dissemination of propaganda—"to develop a climate of opinion." In view of this, it is interesting to contemplate foundation statements such as the following:

"The officers of the Corporation find it necessary with increasing frequency to inform proponents of various causes that the corporation, as a matter of policy and because of its legal exemption from income tax as well, is not free to undertake support of enterprises carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation." (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1945, *op. cit.*, p. 15.)

This came from the Carnegie Corporation, whose president is on the American Council on Race Relations board. From the Rockefeller Foundation, which gave the council money: "The Foundation does not . . . support campaigns to influence public opinion on any social or political questions, no matter how important or disinterested these questions may be." (Rockefeller

NOTES

Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1941, *op. cit.*, p. 54.) And: "The Rockefeller Foundation is not an advocate of any doctrine or theory, whether in medicine or the social sciences. It has nothing to promote." (*Ibid*, 1943, p. 30.)

122. *Chicago Tribune*, Nov. 7, 1948, p. 1. This was a forthright propaganda job for sovietizing the Balkans, containing statements such as this: "Now I see why the Russian revolution was necessary, from the standpoint not only of backward peasant Russia, but of the world at large. I see now that the salvation of the Yugoslav people and other small backward nations in that part of the world lies clearly and inescapably in the direction of Russia. They will have to . . . attach themselves to the U.S.S.R."

123. *Ibid*.

124. *Who's Who*.

125. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual report*, 1941, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

126. *Ibid*, 1942, pp. 58, 59.

127. *Ibid*, 1941, p. 37.

128. General Education Board, *Annual Report*, 1940, p. 159. Under the General Education Board list of publications resulting from "grants" are *How Fare American Youth?* by Homer P. Rainey, published in 1937 by the American Youth Commission, and *The Family Past and Present*, by Bernhard J. Stern, published in 1938 by the Progressive Education Association. Stern managed to get himself cited thirty-five times in only one government publication reporting affiliations with Communist fronts, and Rainey eight times. (*Ibid*, pp. 71, 72; *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, for Stern, pp. 352, 354, 390, 408f., 466, 589, 650, 657, 674, 707, 710, 801, 927, 931, 973f., 977, 1093, 1148, 1150, 1170, 1177, 1179, 1237, 1256, 1335, 1338, 1379, 1384, 1456, 1555, 1557, 1565, 1617, 1648, 1773; for Rainey, pp. 535, 537, 675, 1037, 1587, 1596, 1599, 1764.

The Carnegie Corporation, however, has remained one of the softest touches for non-academic writers with nothing particularly to recommend them except so-called "liberal" ideology and perhaps a few powerful friends. Listed among books in which "the Corporation has had a part" is one called *Print, Radio, and Film in a Democracy*, edited by Douglas Waples. (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1942, p. 55.) Waples was an associate of Professor Lasswell of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" when Lasswell was on the Library of Congress payroll doing "propaganda analysis" during the war, and was a subject of discussion when Congress investigated that activity of the FCC. (*Investigation of the Federal Communications Commission*, 78th Congress, 2nd Session, H. R. 21, p. 3471.)

Still another Carnegie book, for which a "grant-in-aid" was given, was *Business as a System of Power*, by Robert A. Brady. (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1943, p. 54.) The title of this volume alone is enough to show a general port-side list although Mr. Brady gives further evidence of it by thirteen citations in the same government directory. (*Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 371, 386, 388, 404, 407, 587, 600, 663, 665, 785, 1115, 1383, 1446.) Another title is *Workers' Education, a Wisconsin Experiment*, by Ernest E. Schwarzauber. (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1943, p. 54.) The "Wisconsin experiment" was a so-called "workers' school" on the University of Wisconsin campus which had Socialist inspiration. Still another is *Characteristics of the American Negro*, edited by Otto Klineberg, another wartime Federal Communications Commission employe, who has five citations. (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1943, p. 54; *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 334, 349, 353f., 648, 668.)

129. Carnegie Corporation, *Annual report*, 1942, pp. 58, 59.

130. *The Washington Correspondents*, by Leo C. Rosten, Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York, 1937, pp. x-xi.

131. *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.

132. *Ibid.*, p. xi.

133. *Ibid.*, p. 293.

134. *Ibid.*, pp. 341-344.

135. *Ibid.*, p. 345.

136. *Chicago Tribune*, Jan. 18, 1947, p. 1.

137. 1948 California Report, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

138. *Soviet Power*, by Hewlett Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

139. 1945 California Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 124, 125.

140. 1947 California Report, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

141. *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

142. Carey McWilliams, denied he was a Communist though he was identified as a party member on two separate occasions by a government witness who herself was a former Communist (1945 California report, *op. cit.*, pp. 149, 156), is another favored object for the charity of the big foundations. He was a writer for a special number of *Survey Graphic* magazine entitled *Calling America*, published to propagandize or to "illuminate issues that are a prime charge on Americans," (*Survey Graphic*, January, 1947) as the issue said. This publication was financed by four important foundations, although it was put out by a private New York group called Survey Associates, Inc.

"Backlog of the venture has been a considerable grant from the Julius Rosenwald Fund, and generous contributions from the Carnegie Corporation, Lucius N. Littauer Foundation, and the Phelps-Stokes Fund," the magazine said. (*Ibid.*) The Carnegie Corporation gave it \$3,000. Another writer for this issue was Will Alexander of the American Council on Race Relations. (*Ibid.*, p. 5.) Alexander was associated with Alvin S. Johnson in the Social Science Research Council, and Johnson was on the board of Survey Associates, Inc., publishers of the magazine. (*Ibid.*, p. 5.) Johnson is the man who got the \$20,600 Rockefeller Foundation grant for Hauns Eisler at the New School for Social Research.

McWilliams also writes pamphlets for the Institute of Pacific Relations, previously identified as a Communist front (*Citations*, *op. cit.*, p. 9), heavily subsidized by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, and of this Professor Hocking of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press" is a director. So does Maxwell S. Stewart, who edited a group of IPR pamphlets on China, India and the Far East. Stewart and his wife, Marguerite Ann Stewart, were teachers in the Moscow Institute, and Stewart was an associate editor of the *Moscow News*, published for "English speaking people in the Soviet Union and throughout the world," and recently discontinued by the Kremlin. (Masthead, the *Moscow News*, Oct. 3, 1940.) Mrs. Stewart was secretary of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and thousands of the pamphlets she and her husband wrote have been used in American public school social science courses. Some schools have burned them after the pro-Communist bias of them was demonstrated. (e.g. Delavan, Wis., high school, *Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1947, p. 4.) The Institute of Pacific Relations also managed to distribute more than three-quarters of a million copies of these pamphlets to American troops in Asia and the Pacific during the war. (*Chicago Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1947, p. 4; 1947 California Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 313, 314.)

143. This committee receives money from the Carnegie Corporation, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Sloan Foundation. (*American Foundations for Social Welfare*, *op. cit.*, p. 172.) Carnegie paid it \$5,000 for support of the Stewart-edited pamphlets in 1946-1947. (Carnegie Corporation, *Annual Report*, 1947, p. 46.) One of these pamphlets, *The Races of Mankind*, contained such obvious pro-Russian propaganda that it was even banned by the army and the USO, although the Rosenwald Fund, which helped to finance and distribute it, criti-

NOTES

cized this action as "suppression and distortion," defending its right to issue propaganda with public, tax-exempt money. (Rosenwald, 1942-1944, *op. cit.*, p. 6.) It described this pamphlet, which lauds the "Russian program" under Communism (*The Races of Mankind*, by Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish, Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 85, Copyright 1946, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., p. 26), as "an authentic, scientific statement." (Rosenwald Fund Review, 1942-1944, *op. cit.*, p. 6.) The names of McWilliams and Stewart appeared on the same Public Affairs pamphlet on one occasion. (*What About Our Japanese-Americans?* by Carey McWilliams, Copyright, 1944, Public Affairs Committee, Inc. This pamphlet has the name "American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations" on the front cover. Maxwell S. Stewart is listed as "editor of the pamphlet series, Public Affairs Committee, Inc.," p. 32.)

144. *Keep our Press Free!* by Robert E. Cushman, Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 123, Copyright, 1946, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., p. 27.

145. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

146. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1947, p. 190. *Ibid.*, 1948, p. 224. *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 471, 477, 795, 801, 809, 811f., 949, 964, 1093, 1206, 1210, 1277, 1337, 1375.

147. *Ibid.*, 1941 through 1947.

148. The Rockefeller Foundation describes its grants to the association, in one of its annual reports, as follows:

"In addition to a one-year grant of \$25,000 for its Department of Popular Education, the Foreign Policy Association was given \$110,000 over a two-year period ending December 31, 1943, toward its general budget. The former project is concerned primarily with the organizations of educational work in relation to world problems, collaboration with colleges, schools, forums, women's clubs, youth groups, labor programs, agricultural clubs, etc." (Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1941, p. 231.)

In one of its *Headline Series* booklets, the Foreign Policy Association used part of this money to publish the following statement by Max Lerner:

"If democracy is to survive, it too must move toward socialism—a socialism guarded by the political controls of a state that maintains the tradition of intellectual consent and the freedom of political opposition. And the imperatives of survival are stronger than the winds of capitalist doctrine." (*Headline Series*, No. 61, Jan. 20, 1947, published by the Foreign Policy Association, Inc., New York, p. 65.)

In another booklet, distributed to American troops abroad during the war, prepared by the Foreign Policy Association under the title *Our Russian Ally*, appears the statement:

"Today, in Russia, birth is no barrier to advancement for men and women of ability. If he has the right qualifications, the son of a peasant may become an engineer, an industrial manager, or a general. This is one of the principal advantages of the Soviet system from the point of view of the masses.

"This freedom of opportunity is a recent development. For many years after the Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviet government, fearing counter-revolution, discriminated against the children of priests (who in the Orthodox church are allowed to marry), of czarist officials, of industrialists, and later of Trotskyists. These discriminations, however, have been gradually abandoned.

"Today the younger generation is relatively free of the hatreds and prejudices accumulated during centuries of one form of absolutism or another. Every young man and woman feels that, if he or she is bright and hard working, undreamed-of opportunities for achievement lie ahead. This feeling of confidence has done much to create enthusiasm on the part of the younger generation. The Soviet government has been active in promoting young people, many of

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

whom under 30 hold important posts. They can accomplish imaginative and creative work, free of some of—if not all—the fears, reservations, and suspicions that cast such a dark shadow on their elders during the early years of the Soviet regime.” (*Our Russian Ally*, EM 46 GI Round-table, published by Historical Service Board, United States Armed Forces, in cooperation with the Foreign Policy Association, p. 42.)

149. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Yearbook*, 1947, p. 48; *Citations*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

150. Carnegie Endowment, *Yearbook*, 1947, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

151. Horace Coon, writing back in 1938, before World War II, said:

“The Endowment tells Americans about international problems and urges us to do something about them. It appeals to the idealism and high-mindedness of youth and advocates a foreign policy which would mean that the American navy would be used as an international police force. It encourages British and French propaganda. The Carnegie Endowment might be considered an expensive luxury which we, as a rich nation, can afford, since it supports a number of people doing work of possible academic value, but it becomes a menace to our peace, to the peace of the world, when it agitates for international agreements demanding that we go to war for the sake of the peace of the world. If the nations of Europe should start a holy war against fascism or communism it is easy to imagine the Carnegie Endowment crying for another crusade to make the world safe for democracy. Just as the Endowment helped in building sentiment favorable to France and England from 1914 to 1917, so it is building up the same sentiment today. Of course the Endowment believes that international questions should be solved by judicial discussion. But if a nation refuses that means, then, according to Dr. [Nicholas Murray] Butler [then president of the Endowment], we are immoral if we remain neutral.” (*Money to Burn*, *op. cit.*, p. 126.)

A more accurate prediction of the course of human conduct has seldom been written, for less than two years after it appeared, just as Mr. Coon said, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, head of an endowment supposedly dedicated to peace, was ranting up and down America declaring that “isolationism” was a “sin,” and that the United States ought to get into England’s and France’s “holy war against fascism” with both feet. Furthermore, the Carnegie Endowment is not supposed, for tax reasons, to attempt to influence legislation, but it does. It was one of the chief organizers of the propaganda campaign to put over the 3½ billion dollar gift-loan to England. The 1946 *Yearbook* said:

“Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler wrote the foreword to the resulting brochure, *Fifteen Facts on the Proposed British Loan*, which was edited by Robert L. Gulick, Jr. There was a first edition of 200,000 copies, and a second of 100,000 is now being printed. Hon. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, has this to say about the *Fifteen Facts*: ‘Permit me to congratulate you on the excellent job which I am sure will be most helpful in placing the loan before the public in the proper perspective.’ The board of directors agreed, without dissent, to sponsor a campaign of public education relating to the agreement.” (Carnegie Endowment, *Yearbook*, 1946, *op. cit.*, p. 111.)

152. E. C., House of Representatives, *Appendix IX*, *op. cit.*, pp. 357, 362 f., 346–368, 370, 380 f., 382 f., 409, 417, 467, 469, 589, 591, 649, 758, 930, 968, 971, 974, 1101, 1163, 1170, 1187, 1190, 1192, 1194, 1201 ff., 1250, 1300, 1313, 1351, 1355 f., 1378, 1379, 1384, 1446, 1454, 1456 ff., 1471 f., 1603 f., 1617, 1620, 1649, 1651, 1677, 1772 f. Other official reports have still other listings.

153. Carnegie Endowment, *Yearbook*, *op. cit.*

154. Shapley was the head of the 1949 “peace” meeting described, which the state department referred to as an outlet for Communist propaganda. For

NOTES

his other activities cf. House of Representatives, *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 330, 335, 336, 620f., 778, 981, 1207, 1210, 1338, 1357, 1651.

155. For a partial listing of Bishop Oxnham's activities see House of Representatives, *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 481, 1137, 1202, 1253, 1302, 1455, 1520, 1523, 1611, 1772. For a partial listing of The Rev. Mr. Ward's activities, see *ibid.*, pp. 349, 354, 383f., 391, 397, 401, 404ff., 409, 411, 416-419, 422ff., 442, 458, 473, 540, 620, 640, 643, 650, 655, 669, 746, 758, 764, 769, 793, 937, 970, 974, 1052, 1083, 1090f., 1095, 1110, 1119, 1150, 1164, 1205, 1207, 1209, 1212, 1235, 1238, 1258, 1286, 1297, 1300, 1305, 1307, 1335, 1338, 1351, 1385, 1464, 1468ff., 1474, 1514, 1517, 1562, 1603, 1648, 1678, 1703.

156. Carnegie Endowment, *Yearbook*, 1947, *op. cit.*

157. *Ibid.*, 1947, p. 33.

158. *Citations, op. cit.*, p. 17; *Appendix IX, op. cit.*, pp. 466-470.

159. *Plain Talk, op. cit.*, p. 54.

160. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

161. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual report*, 1945, p. 14.

162. *Ibid.*, 1943, pp. 208-209.

163. Cf. *Newsweek*, Oct. 25, 1948, p. 96.

164. *The Calculated Risk*, by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Macmillan Company, New York, 1947. Armstrong is editor of *Foreign Affairs*, a quarterly published by the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. The Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., received \$60,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and \$50,000 from the Carnegie Corporation in 1947 (Carnegie Corporation *Annual Report*, 1947, p. 30; Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report*, 1946, p. 33). The editorial advisory board of *Foreign Affairs* includes Isaiah Bowman, George H. Blakeslee, John W. Davis, Stephen Duggan, Allen W. Dulles, Charles H. McIlwain, Charles Seymour, Henry L. Stimson, and Henry M. Wriston. Stimson was national chairman of the "Committee for the Marshall Plan." Dulles was a member of the committee's "executive committee." Bowman, Davis, and Seymour were members of its "national council" (Letterhead of the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Ave., New York, 17, N. Y., dated Feb. 5, 1948, soliciting funds and signature of a petition to Congress. On the reverse side of this was the list of the "national council"). Stephen Duggan was the founder of the Institute of International Education, president of which was his son, Lawrence Duggan, who plunged to a mysterious death during the Communist spy ring investigation, and chairman of which was George N. Shuster of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press." Winthrop W. Aldrich, a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, was a member of the executive committee of the "Committee for the Marshall Plan." The following trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation were members of the "national council" of the "Committee for the Marshall Plan": Karl T. Compton, John S. Dickey, Robert G. Sproul, Arthur H. Sulzberger. Former Secretary of State Marshall was the originator of the Marshall Plan. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation. Other members of the "national council" of the "Committee for the Marshall Plan" included Professor Shuster and Professor Niebuhr of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press."

165. Two of the organizations most directly responsible for the book in question were the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies, both divisions of the National Education Association, which claims to represent 800,000 American public school teachers. Both the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association, a radical group which claims a membership of some 8,000 public school teachers receive large funds from the foundations. In one year alone, the Rockefeller General Education Board granted \$250,000 to a single commission of the National Education Association and \$456,100 to the association itself

PREJUDICE AND THE PRESS

(G. E. B. *Annual Report*, 1940, pp. 36, 55). In the same year, it gave \$1,635, 941 to the Progressive Education Association (*Ibid.*, p. 55). This report of the General Education Board said:

"The one new undertaking in the area of instructional materials and methods for which funds were made available in 1940 was a project sponsored jointly by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies [of the National Education Association] for the preparation of a series of 'resource units' in the social studies. In most secondary schools an important phase of civic education is the social studies program. In this area many teachers suffer from a lack of advanced preparation in the social sciences and from unfamiliarity with instructional materials. The most rapidly growing course in the secondary school curriculum is the course called Contemporary Social Problems, or Problems of Democracy, given in the eleventh or twelfth grades. Textbooks for this course have not proven very satisfactory and there is a real need for cooperation between social scientists and secondary school teachers in developing better instructional materials.

"Recognizing this need, the National Association of Secondary School Principals undertook an exploration of the problem with a group of social scientists at the University of Chicago in the summer of 1940. Out of the exploration grew a plan for the development of twelve or more units which would serve teachers as resource material (but not as textbooks for students) in helping pupils gain a clearer understanding of problems involved in such fields as planning and public finance, public education, population, unemployment, health, personal security and self-development, democracy and dictatorship, free enterprise and collectivism, American defense. . . . A grant of \$17,500 from the General Education Board will care for the expense involved in the preparation of the materials." (*Ibid.*, pp. 48, 49.)

In addition to this \$17,500 grant, the National Association of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association received a \$105,100 grant from the General Education Board in the same year. Let us see what the public school teachers in eleventh and twelfth grade got out of this big sum of money to correct their "lack of advanced preparation," resulting from an "exploration" at the University of Chicago, headed by Chancellor Hutchins of the "Commission on Freedom of the Press," directed toward "helping pupils gain a clearer understanding of problems" in a "democracy." The two departments of the National Education Association put out a whole series of booklets on "Problems in American Life."

One of them was entitled *The American Way of Business*, designed from its title to instruct public school teachers and their eleventh and twelfth grade pupils in how American business enterprises are run. One would expect such a pamphlet to be written by leaders in American business, or at least by educators who were familiar with American business. Instead these two divisions of the National Education Association picked a pair of alien-born professors, both of them with pro-Soviet backgrounds. One of them was Oscar Lange, economics professor at the University of Chicago, who came from Poland and was naturalized as a United States citizen in 1937. In 1945, a year after the *American Way of Business* was published, Lange renounced his American citizenship and became a citizen of and official of Soviet Poland. He now represents the Stalin puppet dictatorship of that country in the United Nations. The other author was Abba Lerner, a Bessarabian refugee who was trained at the London School of Economics, the institution of Harold J. Laski, late British socialist. Lerner currently teaches at Roosevelt College, a left-wing institution in the Chicago Loop which was supported by the Julius Rosenwald Fund. (Rosenwald Report 1944-46, *op. cit.*, p. 4.) Both Lange and Lerner, previous

NOTES

to the writing of this booklet, were personal beneficiaries of Rockefeller Foundation grants.

Here are some of the points that Lange and Lerner drilled into the minds of American teachers and their pupils under the guise of an "American Way of Business": That "the idea of abolishing private enterprise came from socialist thinkers who believed that this change would actually further the development and freedom of the individual." That American business men "cannot at the same time claim credit for producing the things that are beneficial to society . . . their aim, when they go into business, is to make money and the good or the harm done to society is a secondary matter, even though there may be a temptation to claim credit when it does good and to evade responsibility when it does harm."

That "the concepts of accounting and sound business that are proper for private enterprise . . . have no necessary relevance for public enterprise." That "public enterprise must become a major constituent of our economy, if we are really going to have economic prosperity." That "it is necessary to have public ownership of banking and credit (investment banks and insurance companies). . . . A publicly owned banking and credit system alone is compatible with the flexibility of capital value necessary to maintain competitive standards in production and trade." That "it is necessary to have public ownership of monopolistic key industries. . . . The legal basis for public ownership of such industries should be provided by an amendment to the anti-trust laws, providing that in cases of proved repetition of monopolistic practices and impossibility of correcting the situation on the basis of private enterprise, the companies in question should be transferred into public ownership and operated on the 'principle of public service.'"

That "it is necessary to have public ownership of basic natural resources (mines, oil fields, timber, coal, etc.)." That "in order to insure that the public corporations act in accordance with the competitive 'rules of the game,' special economic courts (enjoying the same independence as the courts of justice) might be established . . . and that the economic courts be given the power to repeal any rules of Congress, of legislatures, or of the municipal councils. . . ." (*American Way of Business*, by Oscar Lange and Abba Lerner, Published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Council for the Social Studies divisions of the National Education Association, 1201 16th St. N.W., Washington, D. C., 1944.)

166. *Ibid.* Other titles in this same series of National Education Association pamphlets included *Economic Problems of the Post-War World*, by Alvin H. Hansen, the New Deal economist and apostle of "compensatory spending"; and *International Organization After the War*, by Max Lerner, the former associate editor of *PM*, identified elsewhere in these pages.

167. Edwin R. Embree, the late vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation and president of the Rosenwald Fund, who was an important figure in the foundation picture, wrote recently (*Harper's* magazine, March, 1949, pp. 31-32) that there is little evidence the "conservative trustees" of foundations use foundation power to bolster the *status quo*, and "still less" evidence to support disclosures that foundations are aiding communism and communists. On the latter point, however, Mr. Embree did not present any evidence that foundations are not aiding the communists, and he ignored completely the evidence presented in newspaper articles and before congressional committees that they are.